DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 302 923 EA 020 605

AUTHOR Crisci, Pat E.; And Others
TITLE Results of the Two-Year Pilot of the the Achievement Formula That Applies the Correlates of Effective Schools and Recommendations of the "Excellence" Reports To Predict, Monitor, and Enhance Student Achievement.
PUB DATE Apr 88
NOTE 94p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association (New Orleans, LA, April 5-9, 1988).
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC04 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Academic Achievement; Administrator Effectiveness; Educational Assessment; Educational Quality; Elementary Secondary Education; *Excellence in Education; Input Output Analysis; *Instructional Effectiveness; Instructional Leadership; *Outcomes of Education; Program Effectiveness; Program Evaluation; *School Effectiveness; School Role; Teacher Effectiveness
IDENTIFIERS *Effective Schools Research

ABSTRACT

This report disseminates the results of a two-year pilot study in three small rural Ohio school districts of an achievement formula that applies the correlates of effective schools research and recommendations of the "excellence" reports to predict, monitor, and enhance student achievement. Using regression formulas, the researchers found that attendance did not affect student achievement, but that a positive building climate, focus on basic skills acquisition, high teacher expectations of student performance, quality instruction, strong instructional leadership by the building principal, and frequent assessment of student outcomes are typical of schools whose students achieve at or above their expected levels. (JAM)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED302923

Results of the Two-Year Pilot of the Achievement Formula that Applies the Correlates of Effective Schools and Recommendations of the "Excellence" Reports to Predict, Monitor, and Enhance Student Achievement

Pat E. Crisci, Ph.D.
Professor of Education
Kent State University
Kent, Ohio

Judith K. March, Ph.D.
Assistant Superintendent
Columbiana County Board of Education
Lisbon, Ohio

Karen H. Peters, M.Ed.
Director of Curriculum
Columbiana County Board of Education
Lisbon, OHio

Lawrence P. Orrach, M.Ed.
Curriculum Consultant
Columbiana County Board of Education
Lisbon, Ohio

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

X This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Pat E. Crisci

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

1988 AERA Convention
New Orleans, Louisiana

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

EA 080 605

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

One important hallmark of the early 1980s was America's dissatisfaction with schools and schooling. Student achievement had declined remarkably, and since school effectiveness was determined by appropriate levels of student performance, the credibility of the entire American educational system became the object of national concern.

The collective responses of the business and education communities was to conduct a multitude of studies to evaluate the effectiveness of the nation's schools. Ten years prior to the Reform crisis, a small group of educational researchers had recognized the declining credibility of America's urban schools and had sought to differentiate between those that were effective and ineffective.

As a result of the Effective Schools research and the various commissioned studies of the nation's schools, it became evident that schools needed to devote significant efforts to being more effective, thereby increasing levels of student achievement. These studies drew several common conclusions about perceived weaknesses in American education and made several of the same recommendations for reform:

1. Irrespective of social class, all students should be expected to achieve at their optimum level.

2. The overall attitude should be that schools can and do make a difference.

3. School improvement requires strong instructional leadership by the principal to coordinate and monitor various factors related to student achievement.

4. The quality of classroom instruction and teacher expectations must be upgraded [in those areas consistent with the Teacher Effectiveness research].

5. The educational program in American schools must be outcome-based, and the outcomes must be certified at the completion of each year in preparation for the next; skills not yet mastered or only partially mastered must be remediated through systematic and thoughtful intervention.

In studies of schools where these recommendations were already in place, the Effective Schools research identified several correlates as positively associated with student achievement, including improved student attendance, a positive student attitude, a healthy classroom and building climate, evidence of institutional commitment to improved student achievement, effective classroom instruction, positive teacher expectations, and strong instructional leadership by the building principal.

While the Effective Schools research and reform recommendations identified a series of conditions that described effective schools, a major criticism of these recommendations has been that they lack definitive strategies for actual implementation. The problem lies in how to achieve the conditions set forth in the Reform and Effective Schools research.

REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Group Studies

The eighteen-member National Commission on Excellence in Edu-, cation assembled by then Education Secretary Bell to examine the quality of American Schools, released its dramatic report "A Nation at Risk" (Gardner, 1983). Among its discouraging pronouncements were that "the education foundations of our society are presently being eroded by a rising tide of mediocrity" (p. 3) and that schools have been "committing an act of unthinking, unilateral, educational disarmament" (p. 3). "For the first time in the history of our country," the report lamented, "the educational skills of one generation will not surpass, will not equal, will not even approach those of their parents" (p. 5).

Among the many specific indictments was that on nineteen academic achievement tests given in 21 nations, American students never finished first or second and were last seven times. From 1963 to 1980 Scholastic Aptitude Test (SAT) results in the United States fell more than 50 points in verbal skills and 36 points in mathematics (Hunt, 1983). The Commission scorned American students' current rush to enroll in "less rigorous," more "relevant" subjects while enrollments in English, government, world civilization, algebra, and French experienced drastic declines.

The Excellence commission drafted a host of reforms for public schools:

1. There should be compulsory instruction in the "new basics" for all students, including four years of English, three years each in science, mathematics, and social studies, one-half year of computer science, and two years of a foreign language for students planning to attend college.

2. Colleges should raise their admission standards to strengthen the preparedness of incoming students, and thus, force schools to upgrade their own expectations.

3. A series of standardized achievement tests should be established to certify student competence and determine remediation needed.

4. The school day and school year should be extended, and additional homework should be provided.

5. Higher academic standards should be established for admission to teacher education, as well as to qualify for final certification.

6. Salary, promotion, tenure, and retention decisions should be tied to an effective evaluation system that includes accountability for the instruction of identified skills.

7. Various incentives should be established to attract better teachers; career ladders and merit pay should be considered seriously to encourage master teacher status.

8. There should be increased opportunity for citizen involvement in the education program.

9. Greater focus must be placed on administrative leadership and direct involvement of principals in the instructional process.

Shortly after the Excellence Commission report, a second study was released by the Education Commission of the States' Task Force on Education for Economic Growth (Hunt, 1983). Citing the outcome of the National Assessment of Educational Progress for 1979, the Commission Task Force identified several disheartening statistics about the recent achievement levels of American students. Thirteen percent of the 17-year olds could not perform reading tasks considered minimal for functional literacy. Twenty-eight percent could not answer questions testing their literal comprehension of what they read. Fifty-three percent could not write a letter to correct a billing error, and only 15% could write a persuasive statement.

The Education Commission of the States insisted that students will need more than minimum competencies in reading, mathematics, science, writing, and reasoning. It is imperative, the members insisted, that schools raise both the floor and ceiling of achievement. Students must improve their overall performance, particularly in the mastery of higher order skills. Districts must strengthen the curriculum and improve the management of schools to enable principals to concentrate on academic leadership. The major thesis of the report was that "America's future success as a nation--the national defense, social stability and well-being, and the national prosperity--will depend on the school's ability to improve education and training..." (Hunt, 1983 p. 11). The Commission felt it critical that before a student graduates he should possess the ability to learn and acquire new skills that enable him to be trained and retrained many times during his career. The Commission made several action recommendations to improve the nation's schools, many of which were consistent with the suggestions of the Commission on Excellence.

1. Each state should establish its own plan for excellence in education.

2. Partnerships must be established between business and the schools to enlarge the base of economic and civic support for excellence in education.

3. Non-academic tasks currently performed by teachers should be done by non-certificated personnel to increase the amount of time teachers devote to student outcomes.

4. Teacher status, regard, and salary should be increased, and teachers should be more accountable for student achievement.

5. There must be an increase in the academic rigor of learning experiences so as to make them more intense and productive.

6. Schools must provide quality assurances of various outcomes (e.g., the measurement of teacher effectiveness, the establishment of learning objectives, frequent measures to certify competence, and provision for remediation).

7. School leadership and instructional management must be improved.

8. Schools must better serve underserved and unserved students, and extend to them equity, fairness, and equal opportunity.

9. The building principal should be responsible for the instructional program in each school; administrative salaries should be related to the effectiveness with which each individual performs his responsibilities.

A third national report on the quality of American education was released by the 20th Century Fund Task Force on Elementary and Secondary Education Policy (Wood, 1983). Consistent with the Commission on Excellence and the Education Commission of the States' recommendations, the 20th Century Fund study insisted that schooling must assure the availability of large numbers of skilled and capable individuals, without whom America cannot sustain its complex and competitive economy. This third report charged that the schools were overburdened with non-academic responsibilities and that the high regard for academic achievement once held by school staffs had given way to concern for wages, working conditions, and job security. The 20th Century Fund Task Force called for immediate federal intervention in school policy making and implementation to re-establish and maintain educational equity nationwide. Citing previous federal enactments on behalf of education for the handicapped, bilingual education, and the creation of the Education Department, the committee insisted that the United States government mandate specific equity reform and provide the funding necessary to support them. For example, special incentive grants should be awarded school districts to underwrite intervention projects for students failing to achieve.

Individual Projects

While the national committees and commissions deliberated, several individual researchers of considerable renown were finalizing their own studies of American schools. In his Paidea Proposal, Mortimer Adler (1982) had already criticized the curriculum in American schools as being in complete chaos--the plethora of objectives was an abomination, and a common core of general education outcomes was non-existent. Ernest Boyer (1983), in his Carnegie-sponsored study of high schools, extended Adler's Paidea by insisting that schools re-establish a sense of mission and direction actualized by overall goals and objectives in an organized curriculum, articulated for grades K through 12. Students should first and foremost be competent in the use of oral and written language. At the high school level, a core curriculum consisting of two-thirds of the units required for graduation (rather than the current one-half) must be established. In the interest of life-long learning, Boyer felt education must engage in a mutual relationship with career and vocational areas. Boyer insisted that classroom instruction be significantly upgraded to include a variety of teaching styles (lecture, coaching, inquiry, etc.), that the student be involved as an active learner, and that tests and materials be criterion-referenced to identified objectives. Boyer also felt that the building principal should be the primary instructional leader regarding the implementation of the curriculum and be responsible for upgrading achievement expectations and teacher training in each respective building.

Two of the most publicized reports by individual scholars were from John Goodlad (1983) and Theodore Sizer (1984). Sponsored by the Martha Holden Jennings and Kettering Foundations, Goodlad conducted an eight-year study of the nation's schools which involved 43 researchers, 13 communities, and 27,000 interviews in 38 schools. Goodlad declared that American schools are "in trouble, deeply entrenched in the chronic problem of miseducation and in need of extensive restructuring" (p. 26). Goodlad saw the classroom as a "world of talky teachers and uninterested students who work in a context of unclear goals and serious social and educational inequities" (p. 72). Large numbers of students were leaving school ill-prepared for jobs and effective citizenship. Goodlad's recommendations for improving schools included the following:

1. There must be a core of basic educational courses articulated for grades K-12.

2. Tracking should be abolished (heterogeneously-grouped classes performed more like high track students in content achievement, enthusiasm, and response to teacher expectations; the achievement levels in tracked classes sank to the lowest common denominator).

3. Schools need to reorder curriculum objectives; teachers must set forth and monitor clear expectations.

4. The time allocated to student learning should be a function of student aptitude, ability, and rate of learning.

Under the sponsorship of the National Association of Secondary School Principals, Theodore Sizer's (1984) research was conducted over a period of five years in 80 schools. In his committee's judgment, school requirements were far too minimal and should be raised considerably. Classroom procedures were characterized by bargains struck between students and teachers not to expect too much. Sizer insisted that the focus of instruction be on ends or outcomes rather than on means. Diplomas should be awarded on the basis of demonstrated competencies and performances. In Sizer's judgment, specifying the exact amounts of time each student has to learn is to presuppose that all students learn at the same rate and in the same increments. Sizer suggested more of a Mastery Learning (Bloom, 1974) approach to instruction. As with the other individual and group studies, Sizer's committee advocated substantial increases in curriculum requirements to upgrade the overall levels of student achievement, irrespective of ability.

Conclusions

The five studies mentioned and their ensuing reports draw many of the same conclusions about the serious weaknesses in American education and make several of the same recommendations about what must be done to remedy the situation.

1. Schools are not "off the hook" because of socio-economic status or previous learning deficiencies; all students are expected to achieve at their optimum level.

2. Boards of education are responsible for the overall effectiveness of their schools; they must commit institutional resources and the organizational structure to certify student achievements; policies and procedures must be enacted, monitored, and evaluated.

3. The operational atmosphere in each district must reflect the board's commitment to raising levels of student achievement; the environment must be conducive to effective teaching and learning; the overall attitude must be that school can and does make a difference.

4. School improvement will be unique to each building, necessitating strong instructional leadership by the principal to coordinate and monitor the various factors related to student achievement.

5. The educational program in American schools must be outcome-based rather than input-based (the traditional system of time spent and equal exposure); student outcomes must be carefully monitored and certified at the completion of each year in preparation for the next.

Relationship of Reform to Effective Schools

Educators gratefully acknowledge the criticism leveled against American schools as an energy source from which long-needed improvements can generate. While recommendations made by the various commissions and individual researchers are warmly embraced throughout most of the profession, they represent a sort of deja vu--a throwback to the Effective Schools research of the mid 1970s. It is hardly coincidental that many of the "Reform" mandates are consistent with the correlates of Effective Schools identified by the research of Ronald Edmonds and others. If the recommendations made by the "Reform" studies are perceived to be desired OUTCOMES or overall goals of successful schools, then the several correlates of Effective Schools can be considered ENABLERS or processors which lead districts to improved performance.

During a major study to validate the outcomes of the Effective schools research sponsored by the Charles Stewart Mott Foundation, Ross Zerchykov (1984) of the Boston-based Institute for Responsive Education confirmed the five correlates of effective schools. These five characteristics have been found in schools where student achievement levels are well above the norm, and expectations are considerably higher than average. In Effective Schools, there was (a) an institutional focus on basic skills acquisition on the part of the students, (b) a school climate that was safe, orderly, and businesslike but not oppressive, (c) strong instructional leadership on the part of the principal, (d) the expectation that all pupils can and will achieve a minimum mastery of basic skills, and (e) the practice of frequently monitoring pupil progress.

One qualifying thought about the Effective Schools correlates is that researchers do not yet know whether the five are actually causes of instructional effectiveness. Correlational research does not allow for drawing cause-effect conclusions, especially since the research is inductive or discovery-oriented. Care must be taken not to confuse ends with means; it is not the presence of the five correlates but pupil outcomes that define a school as effective. The five correlates describe practices that are means to an end; once the practices are established, changes must be documented to determine whether student achievement levels have improved, thus making the school effective. The five correlates serve as umbrella terms for accumulating evidence about practices associated with effective schools. In his summary of the Effective Schools movement for the Educational Research Service, Robinson (1985) suggested that school effectiveness resulted from concrete actions taken in response to the premise that students could and would learn. A final limitation of the Effective

Schools research is the difficulty districts have becoming effective and staying effective in the context of enormous organizational, political, and economic pressures to remain mediocre.

"Formula" for Student Achievement

Since schools are charged with the responsibilities of educating the American citizenry, and since "education" translates to demonstrable abilities, skills, knowledge, and values useful for successful adulthood, the onus of the "Reform" movement, as well as the Effective Schools research has rightfully become student achievement. This is not to deny that there are many other viable social, psychological, and community-related outcomes of schooling. But the "acid test" of a school district's effectiveness is the achievement level of the students; how well its students score on college board tests, their Grade Point Averages (GPA), their skill levels in a chosen vocation, and their basic literacy and numeracy skills are the standard by which the quality of schools are determined. Unfortunately, an absolute formula for producing maximum student achievement is not available to schools. Formulae presuppose control of all variables, and the myriad of variables beyond the school's control make it impossible to say "doing X to a student under Y conditions will always result in Z achievement." However, several efforts have been made to derive such a formula. Prior to both the Effective Schools research and the national "reform" studies, Carroll (1963), Bloom (1974), and others attempted to set forth achievement formulae based on time or duration of instruction.

In 1963, James B. Carroll conducted an extensive study of learner behavior to develop his Model of School Learning. Carroll observed that learners succeeded in given tasks to the extent they spent the amounts of time needed to learn each task successfully. This "time needed" factor was a function of (a) each student's aptitude (higher aptitude students needing less time and lower aptitude students needing more time); (b) his prior learning (the net balance between accumulated skills and accumulated deficiencies); (c) his ability to understand instruction (a combination of general and verbal intelligence); and (d) the quality of instruction provided. Carroll interpreted "quality of instruction" as follows:

1. Lessons are presented using language that appropriately relates the concept being taught to the developmental levels of students.

2. "What" and "how" the student is to learn is set forth at the outset and frequently restated.

3. The learner is put into adequate contact with the material to be learned.

4. Each aspect of what is to be learned is presented in logical sequence and with necessary detail, with one step adequately prepared for by a previous step.

5. Instruction is adapted to the special needs and characteristics of the individual learner and accommodates his particular stage of learning.

In summary, Carroll's formula is as follows:

$$\text{Degree of School Learning} = \text{Function of } \frac{\text{time actually spent}}{\text{time needed}} \quad \text{(p. 730)}$$

"Time actually spent" is a combination of the lowest of the three variables: time allowed, time a student is willing to spend, and time necessary as determined by student aptitude. "Time needed" is derived by adjustment for quality of instruction and the student's ability or intelligence. As the formula is applied, any of the factors found out of balance can be targeted as the possible cause(s) for failure to achieve.

A second achievement formula study was conducted by Benjamin Bloom in 1974. Comparing achievement of students in 48 states at the end of twelve years of school, Bloom found the difference between the mean achievement of students in the state with the highest achievement and the mean in the state with the lowest achievement was approximately one standard deviation on the national distribution of scores. The average student in the "lowest state" had achieved the equivalent of an eighth grade education after twelve years. "Accidents of birthplace and geography," declared Bloom, "determine that a student in one school may spend one and one-half school years to learn what students in another school learn in one year" (p. 682). Bloom insisted that under mastery learning conditions, 80% of the students can achieve mastery at the same level as only the upper 20% of the students achieve in conventional learning situations. In Bloom's research, the slowest learners required approximately five times more time to reach mastery than did the fastest. Bloom contended that general aptitude or intelligence scores are valid predictors (with correlations ranging from .50 to .70) of the time required by an individual to master the material to criterion. This was especially true for earlier units in the learning sequence. Interestingly, better predictors for later units were the formative assessments utilized in determining the achievement levels in earlier units. Bloom's well-known Mastery Learning theory insists that with adequate time, assistance, and motivation, 90% of the students will master identified objectives.

Two years later, a third study of achievement formulae was released by David Wiley and Mark Harnischfeger (1976). The Wiley-Harnischfeger model (hereinafter referred to as W-H) discouraged the use of standardized achievement tests as the criterion for success because of the significant differences in curriculum covered throughout even the norming classroom and the tremendous variety in amounts of time spent on individual objectives. Wiley and Harnischfeger felt that pupil achievement was directly determined by only two variables: the total time needed by an individual student and the total time he actually spends on a

task. Similar to Carroll's, the W-H model distinguishes among total allocated time, the learning time needed by different students, and the amounts of allocated time actively spent. Quality of active learning time falls squarely on the shoulders of the classroom teacher in terms of classroom climate, organization and management of instruction, classroom strategies, the effective motivation of students, the active involvement of students in learning activities, and the level of teacher communication skills.

A fourth project with relevance to predicting achievement was the Beginning Teacher Evaluation Study (BTES) conducted in California in 1980. In that study, Fisher and Berliner (1980) referred to the Academic Learning Time or [ALT] as the amount of time a student spends actively engaged in a learning task he can perform with success. The match between a student's current knowledge and the task of the moment determines his level of success. In the BTES study, achievement gains were the direct result of accumulated ALT. The most successful ALT intervals in the BTES were those characterized by the following teacher behaviors: diagnosis, prescription, presentation, constant monitoring, and continuous feedback.

In the same study, Barak Rosenshine (1980) admitted that "at present, we do not know what amount of time is necessary for most students to achieve, particularly the less academically successful student" (p. 112). Rosenshine suggested that teachers be assisted in the improvement of their methods by allocating specific blocks of time to increase student engaged time. Rosenshine's work was corroborated by Walter Borg (1980) during the BTES; he found a positive numeric correlation between student achievement and the amount of time teachers allocated to the instruction of specific content objectives.

In a study by Crisci and Lulow (1985) on the effects of teacher absence on student achievement, the data show that a reduction in academic engaged time due to a strike by school employees does negatively impact student reading achievement in districts with long strikes. It was found that the presence of the regular teacher is an important and essential element in the acquisition of mathematics achievement at the sixth grade level for students experiencing strikes longer than 14 days.

One of the most recent studies on achievement formulae was that of Dale Mann and Deborah Inman (1981) sponsored by the School Finance Project of the National Institute for Education. Drawing on many of the pedagogical studies of achievement formulae (Carroll, 1963; Bloom, 1974; Fisher & Berliner, 1980), Mann and Inman (1981) sought to establish a formula from the perspective of cost-effectiveness--that is, how do student achievement outcomes justify the cost of schooling? In their production-function study, Mann and Inman attempted to specify how school inputs--specifically, the variables identified in the Effective Schools research--combine to produce achievement outcomes. The formula is as follows:

$$A = F(X_1\ X_2\ X_3\ X_4\ X_5\ X_6)$$

(achievement) (function of) (input variables)

Variable X_1 is teacher characteristics and behavior, X_2 is administrator characteristics and behavior, X_3 is the description of the student body, X_4 school climate, X_5 pupil evaluation, and X_6 curriculum materials. Among the corollaries of their findings, Mann and Inman (1981) stressed the need for overlap between what is taught and what is tested through curriculum mapping, test analyses, and attention to previous learning. Teacher expectations should be high but attainable and subject to careful, frequent scrutiny for needed modification and reinforcement. Assessments must be criterion-referenced to the content objectives being taught, a concept similar to Mastery Learning. The building principal should be more occupied with instructional leadership than with community relations or business management. The climate in effective schools should be one of expectation that all can and will learn. Norm-referenced testing must be reasonably aligned with the curriculum and be used appropriately before and after instruction to compare district achievement with national outcomes. Criterion-referenced testing must be utilized to formatively monitor achievement if diagnostic-prescriptive teaching is to result in increased achievement.

Mann and Inman (1981) proposed attaching weights to each variable and using a multiple regression analysis to determine the relative importance of each in promoting or retarding student achievement. These regression methods presume that output values can be represented as a weighted combination of input values and can be interpreted to explain the contribution each variable makes to outcome value. The Mann-Inman study revealed that schools can be instructionally effective and, thereby, cost-effective within existing resources if the attitude and belief structure of those governing the schools so determine.

But What of Aptitude?

Conspicuous by its absence in both the Reform mandates and the Effective Schools correlates is the factor of student aptitude, or measured ability, and its causal effects on each child's level of achievement. Although aptitude is mentioned in the achievement formula studies, it is alluded to as a function of the time necessary for a student to learn a skill or complete a task rather than as a key determinant of the expected level of his achievement. While a child's measured aptitude should not be used to predetermine success or failure or deny access to some programs, or force acceleration into others, actual practice has shown that measured aptitude serves as a reasonably accurate predictor of the achievement that can be expected of a child at a given time in his development.

A Proposed Solution

In the two years since the Reform studies focused the nation's attention on the need for drastic changes in America's schools, the predicted groundswell of actual reform efforts

resulting in improved student achievement has yet to materialize. Perhaps it is not so much that school districts are unwilling to initiate reform as it is that they are unsure about how to proceed and how to evaluate their efforts.

One solution may lie in the five correlates of the Effective Schools research. Moreover, the specific means of implementing the five correlates--that is, of relating them to student achievement--could be through an achievement formula, the application of which separates each of the five correlates as factors in achievement. Such a formula could serve not only to establish needed reforms (or certify those already in place) but to formatively monitor and summatively evaluate the most significant desired outcome of the reform effort: improved student achievement.

The balance of this paper consists of: (a) a review of the Effective Schools research to highlight specific attributes generalized to improved student achievement; (b) a proposed formula which attempts to combine the Effective Schools correlates and the most promising achievement models, with the added dimension of measured student aptitudes; and (c) the results of the preliminary investigation to field test the Achievement Formula for District Self-Study.

Review of Selected Effective Schools Literature

Background of Effective Schools Research

Origins. The Effective Schools movement began as a quest to distinguish schools whose students achieved from schools whose students failed to achieve, irrespective of socio-economic status. Credited as the father of Effective Schools, Ronald Edmonds described as effective those schools that bring children of the poor to the same achievement levels of children of the middle class. In essence, the percentage of students failing to achieve in effective schools is no greater among poor families than among middle and high income families. This principle of "proportional mastery" makes it impossible to predict levels of mastery and achievement on the basis of socio-economic status (Edmonds and Frederickson, 1978). In his summary of Effective Schools research, Ross Zerchykov (1984) described the movement as one yielding research that shows what school practices can help "beat the [socio-economic] odds with respect to pupil achievement and pupil progress toward mastery of basic skills" (p. 11). Another major researcher in the Effective Schools movement, Larry Lezotte (1982), identified acceptable achievement for children of all socio-economic levels as mastery of those essential basic skills that are prerequisite to success at the next level of schooling. Expectations were not adjusted downward as a function of economic disadvantage.

If all students could be expected to achieve mastery, irrespective of socio-economic status, and if schools were responsible for enabling each child to do so, it would be necessary to

re-examine the Coleman et al. (1966), Jencks et al. (1972), and Jensen (1969) studies of the late 1960s and early 1970s that insisted schools make very little difference in a child's life. These men had become convinced that socio-economic status and parent aspirations were the chief determinants of student achievement. In their judgment, the schools had virtually no real effect on student learning outcomes. During the research of Edmonds (1979a, b) Brookover (1980, 1981), and Lezotte (1982, 1983), hundreds of schools were discovered nationwide where children of low socio-economic levels did, in fact, consistently achieve at acceptable levels. The Effective Schools research sought not so much to disprove the general connection between socio-economic class and student achievement as to prevent educators from absolving themselves of all responsibility for student achievement. The Effective Schools literature documented what was different about schools that did make a difference in student achievement. Zerchykov (1984) queried whether the correlation between social class and student achievement was the result of "what lower class pupils are like. . . or of what schools serving lower class pupils are like" (p. 14). Are class differences in achievement the result of pupil characteristics as the social scientists insisted or of school characteristics as submitted by the Effective Schools researchers? The Effective Schools studies discovered significant variations in achievement among groups of low socio-economic status students, that could be classified as homogeneous, and who statistically, according to the SES impact advocates, should have had low achievement levels. Such variations could be traced to practices of schools and schooling rather than student attributes.

Methodology. Methodologically, the Effective Schools studies have been widely criticized by so-called statistical purists suspicious of inductive research. Most research on learning outcomes seeks to isolate various factors affecting student achievement and then identify which are statistically the best predictors. By contrast, the Effective Schools research has been described by Lezotte (1983) as looking at instances of success and then describing what conditions were associated with that success. The analysis of data centers around a search for characteristics common to effective schools and absent in less effective comparison schools. Zerchykov (1984) felt the Effective Schools research sought to answer the question "what is different about successful schools that can be made to be different?" (p. 15).

Seminal Studies. Considered one of the pioneers in Effective Schools research, George Weber (1971) found four urban elementary schools whose third grade reading achievement medians equaled or exceeded national norms, two in New York City and one each in Los Angeles and Kansas City. Weber identified five characteristics common to all four schools in contrast to the other buildings in the same districts: (a) strong instructional leadership on the part of the building principal, (b) high expectations on the part of the teaching staff, (c) an orderly, safe school climate, (d) a deliberate and consistent focus on pupil acquisition of basic skills, and (e) consistent and legitimate reinforcement of student achievement through frequent evaluation of outcomes.

In a validation studv of Weber's (1971) research, the New

York State Office of Education (1974) compared two New York City schools that served similar populations but had dissimilar results. The same characteristics earlier described by Weber, were found in the school whose students were achieving at or above the national norms.

In California (1977), 21 pairs of schools were matched on the basis of pupil performance on standardized achievement measures. One school in each pair had achievement levels at or near national norms; the other was not nearly as successful. In contrasting the successful schools with their unsuccessful counterparts, researchers discovered Weber's (1971) same five correlates. A similar study of fourth graders in Philadelphia (Kean, 1979) yielded the same results.

Edmonds and Frederickson (1978) studied sixth grade pupils in the the Northeast sample of the Equality of Educational Opportunity survey. Using traditional regression analysis, they tested an array of independent variables corresponding to Weber's (1971) five factors to determine which made a difference (and how much of a difference) on student achievement. Although all five of Weber's characteristics were found to have measurable influence, an intentional and systematic emphasis on basic skills was the most pervasive factor in each of the school settings.

In Great Britain, Rutter, Maugham, Moritmore, Ouston, and Smith (1979) conducted a longitudinal study, in 12 London City schools, of 10 year olds as they progressed through three years of schooling. The factors distinguishing successful from unsuccessful schools were similar to Weber's (1971) characteristics:

1. There was more academic emphasis as a result of higher teacher expectations.

2. In classrooms, teachers remained on the topic more often; there were fewer interruptions, and classes began and ended on time.

3. Rewards and punishment were used effectively; praise was given to all students who deserved it.

4. More advanced planning and collaborative development of curriculum were completed by teachers.

5. While the age of the physical plant was of no real consequence, neatness--showing a sense of care--was consistently evident.

Several studies during the late 1970s and early 1980s have corroborated at least these five correlates. In an effort to actually use the correlates to bring about school improvement, replication projects emerged. Shoemaker (1982) reported that in 1981 there were at least five state departments of education engaged in School Improvement Projects: New Jersey, New York, Connecticut, Maryland, and Ohio. In the Huron Institute Survey, Miles, Ferrar, and Neufeld (1983) found 2,378 individual schools in 875 districts in 25 states involved in 39 Effective Schools Projects.

Brookover (1981) and Lezotte (1983) proposed specific strategies for implementing the five correlates. Brookover suggested that boards of education begin by making an ideological commitment to school effectiveness as part of the district philosophy. Lezotte suggested actually publishing the district's philosophy on school effectiveness as a way of bringing it to public attention and enlisting community support. Secondly, according to both, districts should re-evaluate their social structure and remove tracking to discourage minimal expectations. Finally, Brookover insisted that districts carefully analyze instructional practices in terms of planning, delivery, and evaluation to identify specific areas of need. Lezotte added that principals may need specific retraining to become instructional leaders. Teachers may need to be trained to use student achievement data as a basis for program and student evaluation. Quality instruction is not coincidental or random; it can be identified and described as a common body of knowledge, replicable within a building or entire district.

Common Characteristics of Effective Schools

The KEDS Desegregation Assistance Center at Kent State University consolidated the most frequently-cited Effective Schools research into a series of procedures for establishing school effectiveness programs. In a pamphlet describing KEDS' services, Director Ben Turner (1983) annotated Weber's (1971) five correlates of Effective Schools.

1. Principals' Characteristics and Behavior. The principal:
   a. interprets the school mission to the staff;
   b. provides guidance, support, and encouragement to students and staff;
   c. serves as a communication link to parents and staff:
   d. engages in continuous monitoring of pupil progress relative to the achievement of priority skills.
2. Teachers' Characteristics and Behavior. The teacher:
   a. believes that all students can master the basic skills he or she is seeking to teach;
   b. believes that he or she has the ability to provide the required instructional program;
   c. makes substantial use of basic principles of learning and instruction.
3. School and Classroom Climate. The climate:
   a. conveys a strong sense of academic mission;
   b. includes high expectations which are conveyed to all students;
   c. is conducive to effective classroom management through structured learning experiences;
   d. allows for giving priority to academics as evidenced in increased amounts of allocated time;
   e. permits maximizing academic engaged time (time-on-task).

4. Instructional Emphasis. The curriculum:
   a. includes grade level objectives in reading, mathematics, and language arts;
   b. provides for planning and monitoring for full content coverage
5. Pupil Evaluation. Evaluation:
   a. includes frequent assessment of student progress on a routine basis;
   b. contains precise and informative report cards with emphasis on acquisition of basic school skills.

In the background section of "A Nation at Risk", (Gardner, 1983), Miles et al. (1983) are cited as alleging that the Effective Schools research actually prompted the Reform movement. Miles et al. found that most of the effective schools they studied invoked the original five characteristics, the application of which included: (a) a system for extensive data collection and continuous feedback, (b) school-wide planning by teams and task forces, (c) technical assistance and consultation for program management, (d) intensive staff training and reinforcement, and (e) district (or alternative) funding to support initial development and annual recurring costs. Miles et al. analyzed the similarities between what they termed the Excellence and Effectiveness programs. Each is a positive response to national criticism of education; each assumes that schools can do a better job. Each is concerned about student achievement; each has a "formula" for increasing school effectiveness by making schools more businesslike and orderly, and thereby intensifying the focus on academics and increasing student expectations.

The differences between the Excellence and Effectiveness programs identified by Miles et al. (1983) are worthy of note though not irreconcilable. Excellence, focused at the high school level, dealt with higher-thinking and mastery of concepts above basic skills and spotlighted achievement among the best and brightest. The focus of Effectiveness has been at the elementary level; efforts have centered on the basic skills, and the achievement emphasis has been for all students, irrespective of ability or socio-economic status. Excellence was based on a philosophical premise; the basis for Effectiveness was discovery research. Excellence showed the discrepancy between values about what should be and facts about what is; Effectiveness targeted what is possible. Excellence insisted on overall improvements: Effectiveness acknowledged that choices had to be made (e.g., should the limited resources be spent to provide tutoring services to all 3rd graders or to provide all 9th graders with computer literacy?). Both movements share one precarious footnote. As yet, there is no empirical evidence for either program that suggests reforms and practices will consistently result in improved achievement. Only time and continued study will assembly the necessary evidence.

Although most of the literature addresses five correlates of Effective Schools, a sixth correlate has been suggested by several studies: parent involvement or support. (California, 1977; Wagenaar, 1977; Keesling, 1980; and Armor, 1977) Although parent

involvement should and has been an invaluable addition to instructional programs nationwide, Zerchykov (1984) stopped short of identifying it as a sixth correlate. "The nexus between economic class and achievement and class and levels of parent involvement makes it difficult to isolate the independent effects of participation on a school's achievement profile" (p. 26). Zerchykov found no studies which were able to disentangle the separate effects of class and participation on student achievement profiles. In one study, Brookover and Lezotte (1979) found that there was less parent involvement in schools identified as "improving."

Correlate #1: Institutional Focus

Nearly every major study on School Effectiveness paid special attention to institutional focus. In their review of 1,200 school effectiveness studies, Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980) discovered that among the foremost success factors were instructional leaders who framed clearly stated goals for the entire district, set high achievement standards, and were entrepreneurial in procuring resources for teachers.

Clancy (1982) studied Michigan elementary schools and identified the 19 which showed the greatest improvement in overall mathematics and reading test scores between 1976 and 1979. Two of the seven organizational factors attributed to their success were (a) a district superintendent who emphasized academic achievement and (b) expectations clearly understood by all district parties.

In their study of improving and declining schools, Brookover and Lezotte (1977) discovered that boards of education in improving schools placed significantly more emphasis on accomplishing basic reading and math goals and were more specific in their goals and objectives than were the declining schools. Lieberman and Miller (1981) analyzed three successful school effectiveness programs: the Concerns-Based Adoption Model, the Rand Change Agent Study, and the I/D/E/A Kettering project. The foundation for all three programs was an organizational level commitment to the small details and the regular routines of daily practice. In studying 52 New Jersey public elementary schools to identify organizational factors that determine student achievement, Azumi and Madhere (1982) discovered that the more clearly teachers felt school goals were defined, the higher the achievement levels were. Lezotte's (1983) definition of institutional focus was the K-12 curriculum. Curriculum should be strong, well-defined, and uniform, to provide a systematic foundation for the measurement of pupil mastery.

In a production-function study of school effectiveness projects, Duckworth (1981) developed a conceptual paradigm to organize the evidence on teacher effectiveness and student achievement in terms of several levels. How students performed depended on a number of factors, including self-esteem, motivation, opportunities to learn, and various teacher attributes and behaviors. Much of what teachers did was determined by the support and direction received from the building principal. The extent to which the building principal influenced teachers to do

the "right things" was, in part, a function of district-level administrative policy or institutional focus. The regulations formulated by district leaders were influenced by mandates from the community served. Finally, the extent to which the public brought pressure to bear on district leaders depended on the information it had about how district practices and policies could be applied to yield greater levels of student achievement.

Correlate #2: School Climate

In his summary of Effective Schools Research for the Educational Research Service, Glen Robinson (1985) identified the most frequently cited attributes of school climate in the literature. The climate in Effective Schools is characterized as follows:

1. Atmosphere is orderly and businesslike.
2. Discipline is consistent, fair, and firm.
3. There is a cooperative, congenial atmosphere.
4. There are few classroom interruptions.
5. Parents are positively involved in the learning process.
6. Relationships with the school community are positive.
7. Materials and facilities are adequate and accessible.
8. The physical plant is not necessarily new but always well-kept.

Lezotte's (1982) study of school climate revealed that the district's physical environment reflected the norms, beliefs, and attitudes held by its citizens about education. Those same norms and beliefs were ultimately manifested in student attitudes and achievement. Lezotte formulated seven dimensions of school learning climate:

1. The staff believes that all children can learn what is expected of them.
2. Teachers believe that students can learn what they can teach them.
3. The staff believes that schools exist to insure that students master basic cognitive skills and that resources are adequate to do so.
4. The staff is willing to forego some degree of autonomy to insure that individual efforts fit into the long-term, overall goals of the school.
5. Teachers are willing to look to their professional colleagues for advice, support, and guidance; they see themselves as part of an overall team working toward common purposes.
6. Teachers recognize the need for curricular and instructional coordination and support; they look to and expect the principal to be an instructional leader.
7. The atmosphere is extremely businesslike and conveys a sense of importance about the teaching and learning of essential skills.

Weber's (1971) research in four metropolitan schools interpreted climate as a "good atmosphere" with a sense of order, purpose, and pleasure in learning. Comar (1980) asserted that in a school climate of good interpersonal relationships and adequate teaching, all children will learn at expected grade levels.

Correlate #3: Instructional Leadership

One of the most frequently cited attributes of Effective Schools is the active presence of the principal as an effective instructional leader. Zerchykov (1984) summarized that instructional leadership is not a trait but a set of behaviors and previously acquired skills. It is neither dictatorial nor unassertive; it is nourished by a level of respect not imposed but created by a sense of followership. Effective instructional leadership cannot be legislated; it is inherent in what a person does and says. Lezotte (1983) suggested that principals in Effective Schools are active participants in the educational process; conduct frequent, helpful classroom observations; involve themselves directly with instruction; and offer proven visible alternatives for unsuccessful situations. In reviewing seven studies of the principal as an effective leader, Cotton and Savard (1980) identified three common characteristics:

1. He or she sets, communicates, and monitors reasonable expectations to the staff.
2. He or she conducts frequent and substantive classroom observations.
3. He or she actively participates in the instructional program.

Robinson (1985) listed nine attributes of successful instructional leadership culled from the Effective Schools literature. The effective principal: (a) plays an assertive instructional role; (b) is seriously goal- and task-oriented; (c) is well organized; (d) conveys high expectations to students and staff; (e) clearly defines and effectively communicates policies; (f) makes frequent classroom visits; (g) maintains high visibility and availability to students and staff; (h) provides strong, reliable support of teaching staff; and (i) is adept at parent and community relations.

Two qualifiers about the principal's leadership that consistently have appeared in the Effective Schools research relate to a perceived lack of time and a perceived lack of support from superiors and subordinates. Zerchykov (1984) insisted that principals cannot and should not be accountable for more effective leadership unless adequate time is provided. Austin (1979) concluded that a principal's effectiveness depends on the amount of support, in the form of time and training, provided by upper level administrators and the board of education.

Several studies have focused on the importance of communication in the role of the effective principal. In their study of 52 Newark, New Jersey, elementary schools to determine student achievement, Azumi and Madhere (1982) discovered that schools with higher achievement levels were characterized by more communication between staff and principals and greater frequency of principal

observations and evaluations. Weber (1971) had identified strong instructional leadership as one of the deciding factors in the four effective urban schools. Gigliotti and Brookover (1975) discovered that principal expectations and teacher evaluations were positively correlated with student achievement. In the Philadelphia study of 245 variables that affect reading growth, it was determined that the more the principals observed in classrooms, the better the pupils achieved (Brookover, 1981). Brookover and Lezotte (1979) discovered that principals in improving schools were less "chummy" with staff members than were those in declining schools, but, at the same time, they were more active in instructional leadership and discipline.

One other important role of the effective principal is in curriculum. In the California study (1977), principals in higher achieving schools had more years of experience, were perceived by teachers as more helpful and supportive, and had more of an influence on curriculum development than did their counterparts in the lower achieving schools. In the Clancy study (1982), the principal in each of the nineteen effective schools was a strong leader in the school and was knowledgeable about curricular and instructional matters.

Also in the California study (1977), principals in effective school had greater influence and authority in hiring staff. Several studies revealed that the most effective principals had prior experiences as reading specialists. This was confirmed in the results of the Weber (1971), Clancy (1982), and Clark et al. (1980) research, and in the New York (1974) and Philadelphia (Brookover, 1981) studies. Two other studies focused on the importance of behavioral objectives in Effective Schools and the principal's responsibility in helping teachers develop objectives. In a study for the American Educational Research Association on behavioral objectives, Melton (1981) discovered the importance of the principal in working with teachers on the proper use of objectives. Clancy's study resulted in similar findings about behavioral objectives and the building principal.

A final responsibility of the principal as instructional leader has to do with lesson planning. In a study of 5th grade mathematics classes, Carnahan (1980) discovered that students spent more time on task when the teacher had planned and organized lessons well. Huit and Segars (1980), Talmage and Rasher (1978), and Clancy (1982) all studied the effects of diagnostic lesson planning, well orchestrated among entire building staffs. From these and other studies, Zerchykov (1984) inferred that the more that short-term and long-term plans were disaggregated to account for the ability levels and learning styles of different pupils in a classroom, the more impact lesson planning had on student achievement.

Instructional leadership, although usually associated with the building principal, is also the responsibility of curriculum consultants, program directors, and staff developers. In the Crandall study (1983), reference was made to instructional leadership as provided by a "constellation of players" (p. 19).

Correlate #4: Teacher Expectations

In his summary of the Effective Schools research, Zerchykov (1984) reported that in the schools where student achievement levels were at or above national norms, the most apparent factor was that teachers expected their students to achieve. They had refused to accept the early seventies convention that some children were so culturally or economically deprived that they would never catch up (p. 43).

In the Brookover and Lezotte (1977) study of declining and improving schools in Michigan, teachers in the declining schools spent less time on direct instruction and were less specific about instructional objectives because they had lower expectations for their students. When questioned, teachers and principals in the declining schools actually declared that their students could not master basic skills. Teachers in improving schools were more specific about their instructional goals and objectives and spent more time in direct instruction. When questioned, staffs in the improving schools indicated that they actually were dissatisfied with current levels of achievement; they felt students could perform at higher levels.

Robinson (1985), in his summary of teacher expectations found in the Effective Schools research, contended that staff members in less effective schools attributed the lack of student achievement to causes over which they had no control. Teachers in effective schools provided (a) goal-oriented instruction, (b) frequent assessment and monitoring of student achievement, (c) immediate feedback to students, (d) instruction appropriate to the developmental levels of students, (e) emphasis on the acquisition of basic skills, (f) continuity of instruction across grade levels, (g) effective instruction within heterogeneously grouped classrooms, and (h) effectively managed instructional time.

Brookover's study of secondary schools (1981) resulted in similar findings regarding teacher expectations. Teachers in the effective schools felt they could teach all their students without relying on outside specialists or removing "troublesome" students. Although effective teachers differentiated instruction in terms of individual needs, there was a concerted effort not to stratify or discriminate against less able students. The greater the difference in academic status among students, the less effective were the schools in Brookover's study. In their study of 20 Detroit schools, Edmonds and Frederickson (1978) discovered that teachers in the effective schools believed there should be a common standard for all students. The results of studies by Azumi and Madhere (1982) and Weber (1971) corroborated these findings.

Gigliotti and Brookover (1975) discovered a high correlation between students' perceptions of parent and teacher expectations and the students' actual levels of achievement. There was also a high correlation among student achievement, the extent to which teachers pressed for increased achievement, and principal expectations of classroom teachers.

One interesting corollary to the teacher expectations research was the influence of teacher inservice on expectations of student achievement. Stallings (1980) divided teachers into two groups. Teachers in Group A were provided six workshops on teacher expectations and use of instructional time; Group B teachers were used as the control group and were not given workshop training. Students of the Group A teachers gained an average of six months more in measured reading achievement than did students of Group B teachers.

Some Effective Schools research provided information about specific teaching strategies. Huit and Segars (1980) reviewed major Effective Schools studies and identified four characteristics of teacher effectiveness:

1. Instruction was geared to individual consideration based on students' prior knowledge and learning. style.
2. At least 60% of the skills and knowledge assessed by achievement tests were actually taught.
3. Appropriate amounts of time were allocated for learning; some students required more time than did others.
4. Students were provided with activities that generated moderate to high success in learning outcomes.

Lezotte's (1983) study found that effective teachers were good classroom managers, fostered greater student involvement and cooperation, and established a consistently productive working environment. The outcomes of these teaching practices included higher levels of student involvement; increased awareness on the part of students as to what is expected of them; relatively little wasted time, confusion, and disruption; and a work-oriented, yet relaxed, classroom atmosphere.

Hunter (1984) defined teaching as a process of making and implementing decisions before, during, and after instruction. Three assumptions made by effective teachers would be: (a) that every student has the potential for learning the next thing beyond that which he or she already knows, (b) that students learn at different rates and use different modes and strategies to learn, and (c) that students need different kinds of assistance and stimulation by the teacher at different points in time.

Zerchykov (1984) summarized strategy research by claiming there is no foolproof educational technology that works the same for all students. "Pedagogic strategies that work for high ability students often do not benefit slow learners" (p. 36).

Six Effective Schools studies addressed teacher expectations in terms of behavioral objectives. Melton's (1981) research discussed placement of objectives in the lesson; Tursman (1981) referred to goals and objectives as academic "press." Clancy (1982) considered effective teacher expectations in the context of mastery learning. In the Brooklyn study, Levine and Stark (1982) advocated a district-wide list of essential skills, criterion-

referenced tests to assess mastery, and diagnostic-prescriptive instruction. Brookover et al.'s (1980) study for ASCD recommended that teachers adhere to identified objectives in the basic skills, the humanities, sciences, and social sciences. Cohen's research (1981) served as a reminder that the use of objectives should not be perceived as as "quick fix" merely to satisfy minimum competency testing requirements; nor should identified objectives be limited to basic skills and lower level learning.

Prior information about students had positive impact on teacher expectations. In a study of 5th grade mathematics classes, Carnahan (1980) found that the more information teachers had about their students' achievement and abilities, the more effective instruction they provided.

A final aspect of teacher expectations in the Effective School research is the timely use of praise. Lezotte (1982) insisted that effective teachers fostered positive feelings among students regarding their self-confidence and ability to learn. A one-time advocate of teacher praise, Brophy (1981) concluded that teacher praise had more motivating effect on other students than it did on the recipient of the praise. Silversmith (1979) compared the effects of praise on young children with its effects on older children; he also studied the effect of criticism on student achievement. Young children responded well to praise; older children responded more to grades. The most effective feedback was minimal praise given for the task at hand. Criticism was correlated with low achievement. The study by Rutter et al. (1979) of effective London schools identified praise as a significant part of the teacher's repertoire. The Stallings (1980) study found that praise and support during the learning task was especially effective for low achieving students and that supportive and corrective activities were more effective than tasks involving silent reading and writing. Tursman's study (1981) found that teacher cues and feedback were among teaching behaviors that consistently made a difference in student outcomes. In their study of the correlation of self-confidence and praise, Beane, Lipka, and Ludewig (1980) discovered that consistent positive feedback was more effective than a few random compliments. Brookover's (1981) Philadelphia study revealed that study success depended on a relatively high self-concept and the feeling that one can succeed at school work.

Correlate #5: Monitoring Pupil Progress

"With this variable," claimed Zerchykov (1984), "there is a deceptive sense of the obvious." The key is to "monitor continuous progress, not just aggregate levels of achievement." Effective Schools have a longitudinal, data-based record of pupil progress "that is and isn't working" (p. 61). Robinson's (1985) summary of research identified several attributes of effective monitoring:

1. The monitoring is ongoing.
2. Progress is communicated to students, parents, and the community at large.
3. The effectiveness of the system is evaluated periodically.

In a review of monitoring systems from 27 Effective Schools studies, Kash and Bouch (1982) found no best way to monitor progress. Immediate teacher feedback in response to current performance, however, was positively related to pupil achievement.

According to the California study (1977), Effective Schools made greater use of standardized tests than teacher-made tests for placement and evaluation purposes. The Clancy (1982) study found that Effective Schools utilized more diagnostic testing upon which performance objectives and progress measures were based. Purves and Levine (1975) studied school effectiveness in 22 countries. Among the principles discovered were that assessment is a normative process, that pupil performance on standardized measures is a reasonable indicator of academic ability and general intelligence, and that pupil characteristics both predict and delineate academic performance.

The results of the Beginning Teachers Evaluation Study (BTES) included a recognition of the necessity for developing and using valid assessment if instruction were to be truly diagnostic-prescriptive. Lezotte's criteria (1982) for measurement of student achievement are that the assessments be locally rather than commercially developed, nationally validated, based on local curricular objectives, individually-referenced, and as objective as possible, so as to eliminate the effects of teacher subjectivity.

THE ACHIEVEMENT FORMULA

One specific means by which a district can implement the reform recommendations and integrate the Effective Schools/ Teacher Effectiveness correlates is by using a form of self-analysis. The Achievement Formula is a paradigm for district self-study whereby elementary and secondary schools may assemble and analyze student achievement data in the context of each factor identified by the above research. The results of the self-study are presented in an easily read series of tables that graphically display the current status of factors affecting student achievement within the district. The compilation of the data represents an achievement trail. Student achievement data are displayed on a grid as Prior Level of Student Achievement, Student Aptitude, Predicted Level of Student Achievement, and Actual Level of Student Achievement. The Discrepancey Between the Predicted and Actual Level is the impetus for the district to examine its overall effectiveness in terms of the Effective Schools/Teacher Effectiveness correlates. Drawing from this research and the reform recommendations, data are displayed on School Climate, Institutional Goals and Objectives, Teacher Expectations, Quality of Instruction, Instructional Leadership by the Building Administrator, Student Attendance and Student Attitude. These factors are used in the analysis of the underlying causes for the discrepancy between Actual and Expected Levels of achievement. This analysis will serve the district as a blueprint for intervention.

The Achievement Formula was developed in 1985 and shared at the national convention of the American Educational Research Association (AERA) in 1986. Data from the study conducted during the Pilot have been compiled and will be presented at the AERA Convention in 1988 at the Effective Schools Special Interest Group (SIG). The piloting activity during the two intervening school years occurred in three small northeast Ohio school districts.

Objectives

The objectives of the Achievement Formula project include the following enablers or processes for participating districts:

1. Bring student achievement closer to measured ability, and reduce any significant discrepancy between the actual and expected levels of student achievement.

2. Assemble data on attendance, student attitude toward school, overall school climate, quality of instruction, teacher expectations, effectiveness of building leadership, and institutional focus as a basis for analyzing any significant discrepancies between actual and expected levels of student achievement.

3. Provide extensive training for building principals in diagnostic-prescriptive analysis of classroom teaching to facilitate consistent effectiveness in the Quality of Instruction and Teacher Expectations.

4. Upgrade the articulation of district curriculum objectives or outcomes between grade levels and within subject areas.

5. Translate data collected on each of the correlates into specific performance goals for all district personnel.

Unlike traditional studies of achievement, which describe student achievement as a standardized test score, the Achievement Formula Self-Study project is unique in that it describes student achievement in terms of the district's curriculum objectives. Since the objectives measured by standardized tests are not necessarily consistent with what actually is being taught in the district, it is by far more useful to a district to examine student achievement in the context of its own curriculum. A second innovative feature of the Achievement Formula Self-Study is that the reports provide comprehensive, yet easily interpreted, analyses of several factors within the district that directly impact student achievement and which are within the district's power to improve.

METHODS, TECHNIQUES AND DATA SOURCE

Following a presentation on the Achievement Formula to several school superintendents in northeast Ohio, three small rural school districts volunteered to participate in the pilot study. A total of 165 students in mathematics at grade 4, 167 students in language arts at grade 4, 78 students in mathematics at grade 7, 79 students in language arts at grade 7, and 35 in language arts at grade 10 were involved in the study. In two districts, all grade 4 students were involved in the study, and in the third district, one grade 4 classroom was chosen by district administration. All students in the grade 7 sample are from one of the districts, and the grade 10 group is comprised of a random sample of students from two of the districts.

At the end of the 1985-86 school year, Prior Level of Achievement data in mathematics and language arts were collected for each student from the third, sixth, and ninth grade teachers, respectively. These data were defined as a percentage of on-level mastery of the district's curricular objectives achieved by each student during the third, sixth, or ninth grade years. Student Aptitude data were inferred from the percentile scores on the aptitude section of the district's standardized test. Actual Level of Achievement, defined as the percentage of on-level mastery of district objectives, was reported at the conclusion of grades 4, 7 and 10. Two regression equations were computed at each grade level, one for language arts and one for mathematics.

The Prior Level of Achievement, Student Aptitude, and Actual Level of Achievement were combined to produce the regression equations for each grade level. The regression models provided the Anticipated Level of Achievement and served as the bases for determining any significant discrepancy between Actual and Anticipated Achievement. Each student's actual level of achievement was compared with his/her anticipated level of achievement to determine if any significant discrepancies existed. "Significant" was defined as that percentage of actual objectives mastered which would be meaningfully above or below the level anticipated. "Meaningful" was defined as that point at which the difference in objectives mastered would be rated with a higher or lower letter grade. For this preliminary study, the number of percentage points was determined as 10.

Pupil Attendance data were collected from district records and reported as the number of days absent per pupil. Pupil Attitude toward school was assessed by using the student version of the Kappa Delta Pi 100 Good Schools Survey (Frymier et al., 1984). School Climate was defined as an aggregate of teacher and student attitudes toward school and was assessed by surveying all teachers in each district and students in grades 4 through 12 with the teacher and student versions of the 100 Good Schools instruments. Descriptions of district Institutional Goals and Objectives relative to student achievement were obtained through an interview with the superintendent or his designee. The questions focused on each correlate of the Formula and sought documentation in Board policies and procedures, in written

expectations for school personnel, in the existence of various support programs to provide needed improvements, and in an awareness of need to be responsive to community perceptions. Evidence of Instructional Leadership was obtained from the "Instructional Leadership Profile", a survey instrument given to the teachers in each building to determine their perceptions of the effectiveness of the principal's overall leadership in the areas of decision making, curriculum/instruction, presence/visibility, and interpersonal relations. This instrument was developed in conjunction with the Achievement Formula Self-Study by project personnel using the attributes of effective instructional leadership as identified in related literature. The "Instructional Leadership Profile" is currently undergoing field validation as well as validation by experts.

During the preliminary study, administrators in the project schools were provided with the opportunity to participate in an inservice program related to the Achievement Formula. They were taught to diagnose and prescribe for teaching behaviors identified in the Teacher Effectiveness research. Nevertheless, no data were formally collected for two of those correlates, Quality of Instruction and Teacher Expectations.

RESULTS

When a school district participates in the Achievement Formula Self-Study, reports summarizing the various data are compiled for review by the district to identify areas of need. Different reports are generated for the different audiences in the district. The Classroom Teacher Report shows a roster of students involved with the study and reports the data collected for each student. [A sample classroom report is included as Appendix A.] The Building Principal Report summarizes the student data for each classroom involved and details the results of the Instructional Leadership Profile as completed by his or her teaching staff. [A sample is included as Appendix B.] The Superintendent Report is an aggregate of all the data from all project buildings and includes a detailed analysis of the district's goals relative to student achievement. [The Superintendent Report for all three pilot districts is included in Appendix C.]

Achievement Data

Using each student's prior level of achievement and aptitude percentile, a regression equation was computed to determine his or her anticipated level of achievement. Separate equations were determined for mathematics and language arts in grades 4 and 7, and language arts in grade 10. Using a difference of 10 percentage points as the criterion, the comparison of actual levels of achievement with anticipated levels yielded the following distributions.

Table 1

Percentage of Students Scoring At, Above, and Below Anticipated Levels of Achievement - District #1

Grade Level and Subject		%Below	%At	%Above
Grade 4				
Mathematics	N=98	24	41	35
Language Arts	N=99	29	41	38
Grade 7				
Mathematics	N=78	29	47	24
Language Arts	N=79	31	35	34
Grade 10				
Language Arts	N=24	42	46	12

A visual examination of the grade 4 data shows that 59% of the students are achieving at a level discrepant from their anticipated level in mathematics. In language arts, 67% of the students are discrepant. For both mathematics and language arts, the discrepancy favors students achieving above anticipated levels. There are 11% more students achieving above than below anticipated levels in mathematics and 9% in language arts.

A similar examination of grade 7 scores shows that 53% of the students are achieving at a level discrepant from their anticipated level in mathematics and 65% in language arts. In language arts, the percentage of students achieving at, above, and below anticipated levels is nearly equal. In mathematics, nearly one-half the students are achieving at their anticipated levels.

In grade 10, 12% of the students are achieving above their anticipated levels, and the percentage of students achieving below and at their anticipated levels is nearly the same at 42% and 46%, respectively.

An examination of discrepant students by aptitude ranges and gender (see Appendix D) reveals the following about students at grade 4:

1. Students whose actual mathematics and language arts achievement is above or below their anticipated level are evenly distributed across all aptitude ranges 0-99.

2. There is a greater percentage of males than females whose achievement is below their anticipated levels in both mathematics and language arts (math: 38% males, 17% females; language arts: 34% males, 22% females).

3. In language arts, there is a high percentage of females (50%) scoring above anticipated levels, while only 26% of the males are above level.

4. Seventy-nine percent of the females scoring below level in language arts are from the 50th percentile and above in aptitude; whereas, 44% of the females scoring above level in language arts are from the bottom half of the aptitude ranges.

A review of grade 7 yields the following observations about achievement as related to gender and aptitude:

1. All students whose actual mathematics and language arts achievement is above or below their anticipated level are evenly distributed across all aptitude ranges 0-99.

2. In language arts, there is a greater percentage of males (39%) than females (24%) scoring below their anticipated levels of achievement.

3. In language arts there is a higher percentage of females (47%) than males (30%) scoring above anticipated levels.

4. In mathematics, there are nearly twice as many females scoring below their anticipated level (31%) as there are scoring above (17%).

Because of the small size of the grade 10 population, a meaningful examination by gender and aptitude is not possible.

Table 2

Percentage of Students Scoring At, Above, and Below Anticipated Levels of Achievement - District #2

Grade Level and Subject		%Below	%At	%Above
Grade 4				
Mathematics	N=63	45	49	6
Language Arts	N=54	17	72	11

Student achievement data for District #2 were collected for grade 4 only. A visual examination of these data reveals a considerable discrepancy in student achievement between mathematics and language arts. In mathematics , 51% of the students are discrepant, whereas only 28% are discrepant in language arts. Of the 51% discrepant in math, 45% are achieving below their anticipated level.

An examination of discrepant students by aptitude ranges and gender (see Appendix D) reveals the following about the students:

1. Eighty-eight percent of the students who are achieving below their anticipated level of achievement are from the 50th percentile or above in aptitude.

2. In mathematics there is a greater percentage of females scoring below their anticipated level; in language arts, both males and females have comparable percentages below their anticipated levels.

3. In mathematics, 56% of the females are scoring below the level anticipated, whereas the percentage of males scoring below is 36%.

Table 3

Percentage of Students Scoring At, Above, and Below Anticipated Levels of Achievement - District #3

Grade Level and Subject		%Below	%At	%Above
Grade 4				
Mathematics	N=14	14	14	71
Language Arts	N=14	7	50	43
Grade 10				
Language Arts	N=11	9	55	26

Although the achievement data from District #3 were used in determining the regressions for grades 4 and 10, the extremely small size of this sample makes meaningful generalizations about the district prohibitive. Additionally, the small numbers make it difficult to examine the discrepant students in terms of gender and aptitude.

A visual examination of the achievement results from District 3 shows 85% of the students are discrepant in mathematics, and 50% are discrepant in language arts. In both cases, the discrepancy favors students scoring above their anticipated levels with 71% in mathematics and 43% in language arts. The grade 10 results reveal 45% of the students discrepant, 9% below and 36% above their anticipated level.

Climate

In this study, School Climate was defined on two levels: teachers and students. Teachers were surveyed to obtain perceptions about the overall atmosphere within their building. The perceptions of students in grades 4-12 were gathered by using a different version of the same survey instrument. The responses from each group were clustered into eight climate factors: (a) classroom practices; (b) teacher and student expectations for learning; (c) student involvement in decision-making; (d) discipline and safety; (e) facilities; (f) staff and student commitment; (g) interpersonal relations; and (h) personal, social, and academic goal attainment. Respondents rated the items for each factor on a four-point Likert scale (4 being the most positive and 1 being the least positive). Respondents were considered "positive" on each factor for which the sum of their responses totaled 51% or more of the points possible.

Classroom climate was described as the percentage of students within the class who reported a positive rating for each factor. A factor was considered to be negative--and, therefore, might negatively impact individual students--if 50% or fewer of the students responded positively. Building climate was described as the percentage of students and percentage of teachers in each building who reported a positive rating for each factor. Scores for teachers within each building were reported separately from student scores to enable a comparison between the two sets of perceptions for each climate factor. District climate was described as the percentage of students and percentage of teachers in all buildings who reported a positive rating for each factor.

The climate scores for each project classroom are included in the Classroom Teacher Report, a sample of which is in Appendix A. A building summary of all students surveyed about school climate is included in the Building Principal's Report (Appendix B). Building and district summaries of climate are included in the Superintendent's Report (Appendix C) and displayed in Table 4.

Percentage of Students and Teachers Responding Positively to School Climate Factors - District #1

Factors	EL #1 ST	EL #1 TCH	EL #2 ST	EL #2 TCH	EL #3 ST	EL #3 TCH	MS #1 ST	MS #1 TCH	HS ST	HS TCH	TOTAL ST	TOTAL TCH
Classroom practice	92	100	80	100	86	100	78	100	66	100	77	100
Expectations	97	100	97	100	94	100	96	100	90	100	94	100
Decision-making	56	10	●44	100	54	60	●34	100	●26	88	●38	90
Discipline/Safety	98	100	94	100	95	100	80	100	73	100	84	100
Facilities	92	100	99	100	91	100	86	100	81	100	87	100
Commitment	96	100	91	100	94	100	80	100	62	100	79	100
Interpersonal Rels.	94	100	94	100	95	100	81	100	71	100	82	188
Goal Attainment	93	100	91	100	94	100	70	100	61	77	76	99
Students	N=152		N=70		N=81		N=198		N=285		N=791	
Teachers	N= 18		N= 7		N= 5		N= 9		N= 9		N= 48	

● denotes areas of concern--50% or fewer positive

Table 5

Percentage of Students and Teachers Responding Positively to School Climate Factors - District #2

Factors	EL #1 ST	EL #1 TCH
Classroom practice	78	100
Expectations	98	100
Decision-making	●41	100
Discipline/Safety	93	100
Facilities	88	100
Commitment	83	100
Interpersonal Rels.	84	100
Goal Attainment	89	100
Students	N=199	
Teachers	N= 22	

● denotes areas of concern--50% or fewer positive

Table 6

Percentage of Students and Teachers Responding Positively to School Climate Factors - District #3

Factors	EL #1 ST	EL #1 TCH	EL #2 ST	EL #2 TCH	EL #3 ST	EL #3 TCH	EL #4 ST	EL #4 TCH	MS #1 ST	MS #1 TCH	MS # ST	MS # TCH	HS ST	HS TCH	TOTAL ST	TOTAL TCH
Classroom practice	95	100	97	93	94	100	93	100	94	100	94			100	95	99
Expectations	98	100	99	100	97	100	93	100	100	100	98			100	88	100
Decision-making	88	100	80	100	80	89	87	100	79	100	76			100	82	98
Discipline/Safety	96	100	97	100	94	100	92	100	99	100	98			100	91	100
Facilities	90	100	91	100	84	100	78	100	93	100	88			100	88	100
Commitment	96	100	97	100	92	100	95	100	88	100	95			100	94	100
Interpersonal Rels.	95	100	98	100	92	100	99	100	93	100	95			100	95	100
Goal Attainment	93	100	99	100	95	100	95	100	99	100	97			100	96	100
Students	N=225		N=150		N=204		N=60		N=88		N=63				N=790	
Teachers	N= 5		N= 15		N= 9		N= 3		N= 4				N=23		N= 59	

● denotes areas of concern--50% or fewer positive

The climate results in all three project districts show that teachers are positive about all eight factors. In Districts 1 and 2, students are negative about their role in decision making, with only 38 and 41%, respectively reporting positive perceptions. All other climate factors in these districts, as well as all eight factors in District 3, are perceived as positive by students.

In one elementary building, the junior high, and the high school of District 1, and in the one elementary building in District 2, students felt negative about decision making. The three buildings in District 1 show that only 44, 34, and 26%, of students, respectively, are positive about decision making, while in the District 2 building, 41 percent are positive. The other two elementary buildings in District 1 are slightly positive (56 and 54 percent) about decision making. In District 3, none of the six buildings reports any overall negative student perceptions.

In addition to their inclusion in the building and district total, project student perceptions about school climate are reported by the individual classroom. Of the 16 classrooms included in the Achievement Formula Self-Study Pilot, students in only one classroom (from District 1) report feeling negative about any of the eight climate factors. For this classroom, only 44% of the students feel positive about their role in decision-making.

Pupil Attitude

In this study, Pupil Attitude toward school was defined as individual student perceptions about each of the eight factors from the Student Climate Survey. From all students surveyed, pupil attitude was reported only for students involved in the Achievement Formula Self-Study. A student was considered to feel negative about a factor when his or her responses totaled 50% or less of the total points possible for that factor. Students were considered to have an overall negative attitude toward school when they were negative about four or more of the eight factors.

The attitude scores for individual project students are included in the Classroom Teacher Report (Appendix A). Of the 281 students in the project, only one student (from District 2) reported a negative attitude toward school; that is, only one student feels negatively about four or more of the eight climate factors. A visual examination of student attitude data shows no meaningful differences between students whose achievement is discrepant from their anticipated levels and those whose achievement is at anticipated levels. Moreover, there are no differences between students scoring above their anticipated levels and those scoring below their anticipated levels of achievement.

Instructional Leadership

In this study, Instructional Leadership was defined as the composite of four attributes or factors cited in the Effective Schools research as necessary for a building principal to facilitate the enhancement of student achievement. These attributes are: decision making, knowledge of curriculum and

instruction, presence and visibility, and skill in interpersonal relations. Within the district buildings, responding teachers indicated their perceptions about the quality of the principal's leadership in each of the four areas. Responses to the items were given on a five point Likert scale with a 5 being the highest rating and a 1 the lowest. [A copy of this instrument is included as Appendix G.]

The Instructional Leadership scores for the twelve principals are included in the Building Principals' Report (Appendix B), and a profile for each principal in the district is included in the Superintendent's Report (Appendix C). A summary of teacher perceptions about the quality of instructional leadership in the three project districts is displayed below. A factor or attribute is considered to be a STRENGTH if at least 51% of the teachers responding feel their principal is strong or exemplary in his or her performance of the duties involved in that factor. A factor or attribute is considered a WEAKNESS if at least 51% of the teachers responding feel their principal is extremely poor or rather weak in his or her performance of the duties in that factor. A rating of ADEQUATE is used if at least 51% of the staff responding feel their principal is adequate or better in the performance of that factor.

Table 7

Staff Perceptions of Instructional Leadership - District #1

Factor	Prin #1	Prin #2	Prin #3	Prin #4	Prin #5
Decision-making	strength	adequate	strength	strength	weakness
Curriculum/Instruction	adequate	adequate	strength	adequate	weakness
Presence/Visibility	strength	adequate	strength	strength	adequate
Interpersonal Relations	adequate	strength	strength	strength	adequate
Number Responding	N-18	N-5	N-5	N-9	N-9

In District #1, it is the perception of the teachers responding that four of the five principals are adequate or strong in the Instructional Leadership skills that facilitate student achievement. The fifth principal is rated adequate to weak in the four areas. Across all five principals, the factor rated least positive is Curriculum and Instruction.

Table 8

Staff Perceptions of Instructional Leadership - District #2

Factor	Prin #1
Decision-making	adequate
Curriculum/Instruction	adequate
Presence/Visibility	strength
Interpersonal Relations	adequate
Number responding	N=22

In District #2, it is the opinion of the teachers responding that the principal is adequate in three of the four areas. The presence and visibility exhibited by this principal is perceived by his teachers as a strength.

Table 9

Staff Perceptions of Instructional Leadership - District #3

Factor	Prin 1	Prin 2	Prin 3	Prin 4	Prin 5	Prin 6
Decision-making	strength	strength	adequate	strength	strength	strength
Curriculum/Inst.	strength	strength	adequate	strength	strength	strength
Presence/Visib.	strength	strength	adequate	strength	strength	strength
Interpersonal Rel.	strength	strength	adequate	strength	strength	strength
Number Respond.	N=4	N=3	N=9	N=23	N=15	N=5

District #3 results indicate that teachers responding perceive five of the six principals as strong in all four areas. The sixth principal is rated as adequate.

Attendance

Attendance in this study is reported as the number of days absent for each student in the project. The attendance for each student is reported in the Classroom Teacher Report (Appendix A). In the two project districts for whom sufficient attendance data were available, the mean number of days absent was extremely low as evident in Tables 10 and 11 below.

Table 10

Mean Days Absent for Students Scoring At, Above, Below Anticipated Levels of Achievement - District #1

Subject and Grade Level	Total	Below	At	Above
Grade 4				
Mathematics	5.93	4.84	7.70	4.57
Language Arts	5.92	5.17	5.86	6.58
Grade 7				
Mathematics	6.66	8.50	4.68	7.02
Language Arts	6.36	6.84	7.06	6.15

For District #1, the mean absence for students achieving below anticipated levels does not differ remarkably from students achieving at or above their anticipated levels. That is, those students with the highest mean number of days absent are not necessarily those who are achieving below level.

Table 11

Mean Days Absent for Students Scoring At, Above, Below Anticipated Levels of Achievement - District #2

Grade Level and Subject	Total	Below	At	Above
Grade 4				
Mathematics	4.98	4.52	6.81	2.67
Language Arts	5.01	5.33	5.05	4.20

For District #2, the mean absence for students achieving above anticipated levels differs somewhat from students achieving at or below anticipated levels. That is, those students with the lowest mean number of days absent appear to be those who are achieving above their anticipated levels.

Institutional Goals

During a structured interview by project personnel, the superintendent described his district's commitment to each of eight factors cited by the Effective Schools research as positively impacting student achievement: (a) outcome-based education; (b) student aptitude or potential; (c) student attendance; (d) student attitude; (e) quality of instruction; (f) teacher expectations; (g) school climate; and (h) the principal as

instructional leader. Evidence for the district's actual commitment to each factor was determined by the existence of: (a) Board policies and procedures; (b) expectations for administrators, teachers, and students; (c) specific enablers for administrators, teachers, and students; and (d) expectations of and from the community.

For each factor, interview responses about policies, expectations and enablers were coded with a one (1) when concrete evidence was present and a zero (0) when no such evidence existed. Thus, for each of the eight factors, a total of nine sources of evidence were examined and tallied to determine the level of district commitment. When evidence for five or more of the nine possible sources was found, a district was determined to have actual commitment for that factor.

The actual grids displaying each district's total score and detailing the interview responses are included in the Institutional Goals section of the Superintendent's Report for each district (Appendix C). A summary of the three district reports is presented in Table 12.

Table 12

Summary of Commitment to Institutional Goals

Factors	District 1	District 2	District 3
Outcome-based education	4	9*	9*
Student Potential	6*	9*	8*
Student Attendance	9*	6*	5*
Student Attitude	6*	6*	7*
Quality of Instruction	3	7*	9*
Teacher Expectations	3	5*	9*
School Climate	9*	7*	5*
Principal as Inst. Leader	7*	7*	8*

* indicates factors for which actual commitment is evident

For District #1, the two factors for which the greatest commitment is evident are Student Attendance and School Climate. The three areas for which commitment is not sufficiently evident are Outcome-Based Education, Quality of Instruction, and Teacher Expectations. The most prominent areas of evidence are Enablers for Teachers, Verbal Commitment by the Board of Education, and Expectations from the Community. The weakest source of evidence is Policies and Procedures.

In District #2, sufficient evidence of commitment is reported for all eight factors. The particular strengths are Outcome-Based Education and Student Potential. The strongest source of evidence is Expectations for Teachers which is present for all eight factors. Other strong areas of evidence are Verbal Commitment by the Board of Education, Expectations for Administrators, and Enablers for Students.

For District #3, sufficient evidence of commitment is reported for all eight factors, with particular strengths in Outcome-Based Education, Quality of Instruction, and Teacher Expectations. The strongest sources of evidence are Expectations for Administrators and Expectations of the Community. Other prominent areas of evidence are Verbal Commitment by the Board of Education, Expectations for Students, and Enablers for Students.

CONCLUSIONS AND IMPLICATIONS

The initial pilot of the Achievement Formula Self Study project was a preliminary investigation to examine the Effective Schools and Effective Teaching correlates in three small rural school districts. Since this is a preliminary investigation, the project staff is hesitant to draw actual conclusions about the process at this point. As outlined in the limitations section, adjustments in data collection and treatment will be necessary to more effectively implement the Achievement Formula Self Study. However, the findings from this initial effort are sufficiently promising to warrant continued and more refined investigation. These findings are summarized below.

1. Attendance in these districts is uniformly above the 90% rate. For discrepant students, there does not appear to be a pattern which would indicate that attendance impacts student achievement for this group. The average attendance figures for groups scoring below, at, and above their anticipated levels do not vary consistently. Students scoring below their anticipated levels were absent no more frequently than were students scoring at or above anticipated levels.

   These findings concur with those of Carroll (1963), who observed that learners succeed in given tasks to the extent that they spend the amount of time needed to learn each task successfully. This "time needed" is defined by Carroll as an interaction of student aptitude, prior learning, general and verbal intelligence, and quality of instruction. The Wiley and Harnischfeger research findings (1976) are consistent with those of Carroll. In the BTES study (1980), Fisher and Brunner (1980) reported that achievement gains are the result of academic learning time. This finding was corroborated by Borg (1980). More specifically, Bloom's research (1974) found that the slowest learners required approximately five

times more time to reach mastery than did the fastest student; but most did reach mastery. In a related study by Crisci and Lulow (1985), it was found that a change in teacher (i.e., having a substitute) as a result of a teacher strike impacts negatively on engaged time and ultimately results in a decrease in student achievement only when the absence is 14 days or more. Crisci and Lulow found that if the regular teacher were absent more than 14 days, mathematics achievement began to decline and it took 19 days of absence before reading achievement was impacted negatively.

In further investigation of the relationship between attendance and achievement, the following factors should be considered:

a. The districts in this pilot study all have a commitment to attaining zero student absence rates, and the mean absence rates indicate that they have been moving toward this goal. The high attendance rate for this preliminary investigation may mask achievement differences that might otherwise result from lower attendance patterns. Therefore, a population from a district with more widely varying attendance patterns should be examined to further study the correlation of attendance and achievement.

b. In this study time on task was defined as student attendance. Further investigations may need to redefine time on task. While attendance in school is logically thought to be an important prerequisite to learning, actual measures of student academic engaged time may yield differences across achievement groups.

2. Project pupils are identified as positive in their attitudes toward school, and school climate is positively rated by both teachers and students.

The issues assessed on the climate survey are consistent with those presented by Robinson (1985) as attributes of effective school climate. Lezotte (1982) revealed that the physical environment of a school reflects the norms, beliefs, and attitudes held by its citizens about education; those norms are manifested in student attitudes and achievement. Student and staff attitudes are positive, and achievement levels are high in the pilot districts. This supports the findings of Lezotte that a positive school climate may enhance student achievement levels.

Comar (1980) asserted that in a school climate of good interpersonal relationships and adequate teaching, all children will learn at expected grade levels. Findings for the pilot study indicate that at least the school climate factor may be a positive influence on student achievement.

While such results are encouraging in a preliminary investigation, redefinition of the criteria yielding a positive rating on both attitude and climate is needed. It is unlikely that 280 of 281 project students are totally positive in their individual attitudes toward school. Also, it is unlikely that virtually all teachers and the majority of non-project students are so positive about the various school climate factors.

3. Eleven of the 12 principals in this study were rated by their teaching staffs as effective overall in their Instructional Leadership. However, of the four factors comprising Instructional Leadership in this study, the role of the principal in Curriculum and Instruction was rated as less than a strength for six of the 12 principals.

   Findings of the pilot study support the research of Lezotte (1983) which suggested that principals in Effective Schools are active participants in the educational process; conduct frequent helpful classroom observations; involve themselves directly with instruction; and offer proven visible alternatives for unsuccessful situations. In his review of hundreds of School Effectiveness studies, Zerchykov (1984) concurs with Lezotte that instructional leadership is not a trait but a set of behaviors and acquired skills. Studies by Robinson (1985), Cotton and Savard (1980), Azumi and Madhere (1982), Weber (1971), Gigliotti and Brookover (1975), Brookover (1981), Brookover and Lezotte (1977) all corroborate the Zerchykov and earlier Lezotte findings and state that the effectiveness of the Instructional Leadership may impact student achievement levels.

   While the majority of principals in this study received a high rating in Instructional Leadership, the importance of involvement with Curriculum and Instruction should not be overlooked. As recommended by various reform commissions and Effective Schools research, a greater focus must be placed on the direct involvement of principals in the instructional process; the building principal should be more occupied with instructional leadership than with community relations or business management. Therefore, some principals in the study may need specific retraining to become instructional leaders. Districts should involve administrators in retraining to better examine the quality of classroom instruction and teacher expectations for students.

4. Each district in the study was able to demonstrate some level of commitment to all eight of the factors identified in
   the Institutional Goals report. Two of the districts were rated positively on all eight of the factors identified for this study, while the third district was positive on five of the eight factors. Data collected show this district to be lacking commitment for those factors most often cited in the literature for effective instructional leadership.

Outcome-Based Education, Teacher Expectations and Quality of Instruction were not consistently manifested by policies, procedures, and expectations for this one district.

The importance of a literal and measurable district commitment to student success is cited by Clark, Lotto, and McCarthy (1980) in their review of 1,200 School Effectiveness studies, and in the Brookover and Lezotte study of Michigan elementary schools (1977), and in the Lieberman and Miller analysis of three successful School Effectiveness projects (1981).

As corroborated by evidence in the literature, if Boards of Education are to be responsible for the overall effectiveness of their schools, they must commit institutional resources and the organizational structure to upgrade student achievement. Policies and procedures must be enacted, monitored, and evaluated to this end.

5. The achievement data collected and analyzed show the majority of project students in these three districts achieving at or above their anticipated levels as determined by the criteria of this investigation. These students are evenly distributed across all aptitude levels, and there do not appear to be any patterns in terms of gender. Students scoring below their anticipated levels were not predominantly from lower aptitude ranges, and students scoring above anticipated levels are not predominantly from higher aptitude ranges.

   This finding is consistent with Bloom's research (1974) on mastery learning in which 90% of the students when given adequate time mastered the identified objectives irrespective of ability. Sizer's research (1984) supports Bloom's concept of mastery learning and suggests that the approach be used even more to upgrade levels of student achievement.

   By implication, Wiley and Harnischfeger's insistence (1976) against using standardized achievement tests as measures of success would allow lower ability students an equal chance of mastery of district objectives as opposed to the automatic assignment to lower percentile ranges on standardized achievement tests.

   When considering their achievement results, these pilot districts will find that, for most project students, the instructional program has been successful. In preparing an intervention plan for discrepant students, each district will need to accommodate students of both sexes and all ability levels,

The results of the pilot project support the findings of Weber (1971), the New York State Office of Education (1979), the California studies (1977), Edmonds and Frederickson (1978), and Rutter, et al. (1979) that schools with positive building climate, higher teacher expectations and quality of classroom instruction, a focus on basic skill acquisition, strong instructional leadership by the building principal, and frequent assessment of student outcomes are also schools whose students achieve at or above their expected levels.

Limitations of the Study

1. Using three pilot districts similar in size, socio-economic level, population, and community culture fails to include the diversity of circumstances and conditions impacting student achievement in other settings. Continued studies should include more diverse district populations as well as a larger sample size, to increase the generalizability of project outcomes.

2. The regression equation used to identify anticipated levels of achievement as the basis for screening students above and below their anticipated levels has not been validated. Three methods for validation will include:

   (a) Examine teacher classroom records to verify whether those students identified as achieving below level are actually performing below level in the classroom; similarly, are those students identified as scoring above level actually doing so in class? Does a difference of ten percentage points of objectives mastered identify truly discrepant students?

   (b) Compare each project student's standardized test scores with his or her criterion-referenced scores used in the project to determine the level of concurrence; to what extent is a student's standardized test score consistent with his or her anticipated and actual level of achievement as measured against the district curriculum?

   (c) Compute the regression with additional students to see if the regression remains constant.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

3. Many of the local assessments failed to discriminate among students. In their attempts to provide intervention and re-test students until they reach mastery, the three pilot districts often reported no real differences in the levels of achievement in any aptitude ranges.

4. The lack of available data on Quality of Instruction and Teacher Expectations was disappointing. Hesitation by the districts to collect these data during their initial involvement was truly legitimate for two reasons:

   (a) So few of their principals had been properly trained to collect such data (see Appendix E for data collection procedures).

   (b) They feared that in most cases where students were scoring below their anticipated levels, the source of the problem would lie with the teacher; if even preliminary data were to imply teacher error, it was certain that the faculty would refuse to cooperate with the study or in any way endorse the entire program.

5. Although the items for each of the eight factors on the Climate instrument held up well in the Q-sort conducted nationally by Frymier and his associates (1984) at Kappa Delta Pi, these items failed to hold up in a factor analysis for the project population. This may be due to the small number of people in this preliminary investigation.

6. Because Kappa Delta Pi did not include a "cut-off" point to distinguish positive from negative attitudes about school climate, the project staff was advised by its statistical consultant to use a simple majority of 51% of the total points possible to identify respondents as positive. This very gross distinction may have failed to identify students and teachers who were actually negative.

7. The voluntary nature of the project involvement in the three pilot districts made principal and teacher involvement strictly optional in nearly all cases. Without a direct investment in the project and its potential, building staffs may not be as conscientious as needed in the collection of data, and the building principal may elect not to receive the training necessary to collect classroom data on Quality of Instruction and Teacher Expectations.

8. The Instructional Leadership Profile is still being validated in other districts; although the instrument held up well under the scrutiny of factor analysis, it was developed by the project staff and will require further field-testing.

One related issue that surfaced about the Instructional Leadership Profile was teacher hesitancy to complete the survey; some reported feeling unqualified, others implied fear of recrimination.

9. The measurement used for student attitude toward school was his or her responses to the Climate Survey; that is, student attitude was actually a measure of his or her reported feelings about the climate of the school. One of the districts planning to become involved in the project next year feels the need to use a student attitude instrument that actually assesses how students feel about themselves in such areas as locus of control, inner motivations, self-concept, etc.

10. The low levels of absenteeism in all three project schools prohibited enough discrimination among students of varying ability and achievement levels to determine whether attendance truly impacted student achievement. Using greater numbers of students and students from more diverse backgrounds will permit further study.

11. The responses to the Institutional Goals interview were from the superintendent or his designee only; this assessment might be more accurate and reliable if it includes another administrator, a Board Member, a community representative, and a teacher in separate interviews by two or more persons.

12. At the time of this writing, correlations are still to be run among each of the Achievement Formula Self-Study factors for which data were available. This will determine which, if any, of the factors are better predictors of student achievement.

13. Due to the primarily Anglo nature of population within the project pilot schools, the racial differences among students in terms of achievement was not a factor. However, in districts serving student populations from various cultural, ethnic, and racial groups such differences may impact upon project outcomes. Every effort is being made to involve districts whose populations are more diverse than the pilot study.

References

Adler, M. (1982). The paidea proposal. New York: Macmillan

Armor, D. J., Conrey-Oseguera, P., Cox, M., King, N., McDonald, L., Pascal, A., Pauley, E., and Zellman, G. (1976). Analysis of the school preferred reading program in selected Los Angeles minority schools. (ED 130234, Report No. R-2007-LAUSD), Santa Monica: Rand Corporation.

Austin, G. R. (1979). Exemplary schools and the search effectiveness. Educational Leadership, 37, 10-14.

Averech, H., Carroll, S. J., Donaldson, T. S., Kiesling, H. J., & Pincus, J. How effective is schooling? Santa Monica, CA: The Rand Corporation.

Azumi, J. & Madhere, S. (1982). Characteristics of high achieving elementary schools. Newark, NJ: Newark School District, Office of Research, Evaluation, and Testing (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 271 099).

Beane, J. A., Lipka, R. P., & Ludewig, J. (1980). A synthesis of research on self-concept. Educational Leadership, 38, 84-89.

Benson, C. S. (1978). Household choice, efficiency, and equity. The economics of public education (pp. 219-260). Berkeley: The University of California.

Berliner, D. C., & Cohen, L. D. (1983). Teacher characteristics and behavior. In D. Lawrence (Ed.) NIE executive summary (pp. 12-17). New York: Columbia University Teachers College.

Bloom, B. S. (1974). Time and learning. American Psychologist, 29, 682-688.

Borg, W. (1980). Time and school learning. In C. Denham & A. Lieberman (Eds.) Time to learn (pp. 32-72). Sacramento: NIE.

Boyer, E. (1983). The high school study. New York: Harper & Row.

Brookover, W. B., Ferderbar, J., Gay, G., Middleton, M., Posner, G., & Roebuck, F. (1980). Measuring and attaining the goals of education. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Brookover, W. B. (1981). Effective secondary schools. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Brookover, W. B., & Lezotte, L. (1979). Changes in school characteristics coincident with changes in student achievement. East Lansing, MI: Michigan State University, Institute for Research on Teaching.

Brophy, J. (1981). On praising effectively. Elementary School Journal, 81, 269-278.

California school effectiveness study, The first year 1974-75. (1977). Sacramento State Department of Education, Institute for Responsive Education.

Carnahan, R. (1980). Effects of teacher planning on classroom processes (Report No. 541). Madison, WI: Wisconsin R & D Center.

Carroll, J. B. (1963). A model for school learning. Teachers College Record, 64, 726-741.

Clancy, P. L. (1982). Nineteen improving schools and why. Ypsantli, MI: Eastern Michigan University.

Clark, D. L., Lotto, L. S., & McCarthy, M. M. (1980). Factors associated with success in urban elementary schools. Phi Delta Kappan, 61, 47-51.

Cohen, M. (1981, April-May). Effective schools: What the research says. Today's Education, pp. 5895-6395.

Coleman, J., Campbell, E., Hobson, C., McPartland, J., Mood, A., Weinfeld, F., & York, R. (1966). Equality of educational opportunity. Washington, DC: U. S. Government Printing Office.

Comar, J. (1980). School power: Implications of an intervention project. New York: The Free Press.

Cotton, K., & Savard, W. G. (1980). The principal as instructional leader (Topic summary report). Portland: Northwest Regional Educational Laboratories, Research on School Effectiveness Project (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 214 702)

Crandall, D. (1983). People, policies, and practices: Examining the chain of school improvement. Andover, MA: The Network Inc. (Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development).

Crisci, P. and Lulow, R. (1985). The effect of school employee strikes on student achievement in nine Ohio school districts. Journal of Collective Negotiations, 14(3), pp. 197-212.

Duckworth, K. (1981). Linking educational policy and management with student achievement. Eugene, OR: University of Oregon, Center for Educational Policy and Management.

Edmonds, R. (1979a). A discussion of the literature and issues related to effective schooling. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 170 394)

Edmonds, R. (1979b). Effective schools for the urban poor. Educational Leadership, 37, 4-11.

Edmonds, R., & Frederickson, J. R. (1978). Search for effective schools: The identification and analysis of city schools that are instructionally effective for poor children. (ERIC Document Reproduction No. ED 170 396)

Fisher, C. W., & Berliner, D. C. (1980). Teaching behaviors, academic learning time, and student achievement: An overview. In C. Denham & A. Lieberman (Eds.), Time to Learn (pp. 7-31). Sacramento: National Institute of Education.

Frymier, J., Cornbleth, C., Donmoyer, R., Gansneder, B. M., Jeter, J. T., Klein, M. F., Schwab, M., and Alexander, W. M. (1984). One hundred good schools: A report of the good schools project. West Lafayette, IN: Kappa Delta Pi.

Gardner, D. (1983). A nation at risk. Washington, DC: U. S. Printing Office.

Gigliotti, R. J., & Brookover, W. B. (1975). The learning environment: A comparison of high and low achieving elementary schools. Urban Education, 10, 245-261.

Goodlad, J. I. (1984). A place called school. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Huit, W. G., & Segars, J. K. (1980). Characteristics of effective classrooms. Philadelphia: Research for Better Schools, Inc.

Hunt, J. B. (1983). Action for excellence. Denver: Education Commission of the States, Task Force on Education for Economic Growth.

Hunter, M. (1984). Knowing, teaching, and supervising. In Using what we know about teaching. Alexandria, VA: Association for Supervision and Curriculum Development.

Jencks, C., Smith, M., Acland, M., Bane, M., Cohen, D., Gintis, H., Heyns, B., & Michelson, S. (1972). Inequality: An assessment of the effect of family and schooling in America. New York: Basic Books.

Jensen, A. R. (1969). How much can we boost I.Q. and scholastic achievement? Harvard Educational Review, 39(1), 1-123.

Jones, B. F. (1982). Key management decisions for implementing mastery learning. The School Administrators. 10-14.

Kash, M. H., & Bouch, G. D. (1982). Teachers in improving educational standards and productivity. Berkeley: McCutcheon.

Kean, M., (Ed.) (1979). What works in reading. (Brief #32) Phiadelphia: The School District of Philadelphia, Office of Research and Evaluation.

Keesling, J. W. (1980). Parents and federal education programs: The study of parent involvement. Santa Monica: The Systems Development Corporation. HEW 300-78-0437.

Kerman, S. (1979). A grassroots project: Teacher expectations and student achievement. Phi Delta Kappan, 60, 51-53.

Levine, D. U., & Stark, J. (1982). Instructional organizational arrangements that improve achievement in inner city schools. Educational Leadership, 40, 38-42.

Lezotte, L. (1982). Effective schools and research and its implications. Citizen Action in Education, 9, 1-11.

Lezotte, L. (1983). What is the effective school movement? The effective school report, 1, 1.

Lieberman, A., & Miller, L. (1981). Synthesis of research on improving schools. Educational Leadership, 38, 583-585.

Mann, D., & Inman, D. (1981). Improving education within existing resources: The instructionally effective schools approach. Journal of Education Finance, 10, 256-269.

Melton, R. F. (1981). Resolution of conflicting claims concerning the effect of behavioral objectives on student learning. Review of Educational Research, 51, 216-231.

Michalak, J. (1972, April 30). Headstart-type programs get a second look. New York Times, sec. 9, p. 1.

Miles, M., Farrar, E., and Neufeld, B. (1983). The extent of adoption of effective schools programs. Cambridge, MA: The Huron Institute.

New York, State of. (1974). School factors influencing reading achievement: A case study of two inner city schools. Albany: New York State Office of Education. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 089 211)

Purves, A. C., & Levine, D. U. (1975). Educational policy and international assessment. Berkeley: McCutcheon.

Robinson, G. (1985). Effective schools research: A guide to school improvements. In Educational Research Series, Concerns in Education Series. Arlington: Educational Research Service.

Rodman, B. (1983, May 11). The president's agenda for the 80s. Education Week, pp. 1, 9.

Rosenshine, B. (1980). How time is spent in elementary classrooms. In C. Denham & A. Lieberman (Eds.) Time to learn (pp. 107-124). Sacramento: National Institute of Education.

Rutter, M., Maughan, B., Mortimore, P., Ouston, J., & Smith, A. (1979). Fifteen thousand hours: Secondary schools and their effects on children. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Shoemaker, J. (1982). Effective schools: Putting the research to the ultimate test. Pre- Post-Press, 7(2), 1. (A publication of school evaluation and program development--Division H, American Education Research Association)

Silversmith, D. L. (1979). Teaching styles as related to student achievement: What the research says to the teacher. Washington, DC: National Education Association. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 177 156).

Sizer, T. (1984). Horace's compromise. Boston: Houghton-Mifflin

Stallings, J. (1980). Allocated academic learning time revisited, or beyond time on task. Educational Researcher, 9, 11-13.

Talmage, H., & Rasher, S. P. (1979). A study of the effects of three dimensions of instructional time on academic achievement. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Educational Research Association, San Francisco, CA. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. 173 327)

Turner, B. (1983). (Pamphlet advertising the) KEDS Desegregation Assistance Center, Kent, OH: Kent State University.

Tursman, C. (1981). Good teachers: What to look for. Arlington, VA: National School Public Relations Association.

Wagenaar, T. C. (1977, Sept.). School achievement level vis-a-vis community involvement and support. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Sociological Association. (ED 146111)

Weber, G. (1971). Inner-city children can be taught to read: Four successful schools. Washington, DC: Council for Basic Education, Occasional Paper No. 18. (ERIC Document Reproduction Service No. ED 057 125)

Wiley, D., & Harnischfeger, A. (1974). Explosion of a myth: Quantity of schooling and exposure to instruction, major educational vehicles. Educational Researcher, 13(4), 7-13.

Wood, R. (1983). Making the grade. Twentieth century fund. New York: Task Force on Federal Elementary and Secondary Education Policy.

Zerchykov, R. (1984). What is school effectiveness and what makes it difficult? A Citizens Notebook for Effective Schools. Boston: Institute for Response Education.

II. STUDENT POTENTIAL

A. Board of Education Commitment

"Yes, definitely. In certain situations, they really push. We avoid total reliance on standardized achievement data; as I said before, we also look at other measures to keep track of student achievement."

B. Policy/Procedures

"None in place as yet."

C. Expectations for Administrators

"They are expected to check out deficiencies. We also expect students to be in school and take them to court when they aren't."

D. Expectations for Teachers

"Teachers are expected to follow up on deficiencies."

E. Enablers for Teachers

"Various inservice opportunities are provided on intervention. Students are expected to master the course objectives, and teachers are expected to intervene when they don't."

F. Expectations for Students

"When students fail to master necessary content, we try several techniques for intervention. If, after a reasonable time, the student is still not mastering, we hold a meeting with the teacher, parent, and principal to plan a more formal course of action."

G. Enablers for Students

"Various interventions, plus the above meeting."

H. Expectations from the Community

"The majority of this community are blue collar folks; there really hasn't been a big push for any post-high school training. 30-50% of our graduates take training beyond high school."

I. Expectations of the Community

[same]

III. ATTENDANCE

A. Board of Education

"Yes; this is definitely a commitment."

B. Policy and Procedures

"Yes"

C. Expectations for Administrators
"We take truant students to court; we have a good attendance officer."

D. Expectations for Teachers
"...to report."

E. Enablers for Teachers
"Our attendance records provide helpful background information, and we keep the teachers posted."

F. Expectations for Students
"They're to be in school!"

G. Enablers for Students
"We provide counseling to students and their parents."

H. Expectations from the Community
"They really insist that we allow the students to make up their work if their absences have been excused."

I. Expectations for the Community
"We call home to advise them of their child's absence; the problem is, some parents keep their children at home to help."

IV. STUDENT ATTITUDE

A. Board of Education Commitment
"Nothing yet."

B. Policy/Procedure
"Nothing yet."

C. Expectations for Administrators
"We expect administrators to consider student attitude in their daily operations. Our drug program is scheduled to evolve soon."

D. Expectations for Teachers
"Our biggest problem with staff is that many simply don't deal with attitude. For example, the sarcastic teacher thinks he's being humorous."

E. Enablers for Teachers
"We've made the TESA training available to members of our teaching staff."

F. Expectations for Students
"Our students are expected to be good citizens. If they have trouble on a field trip bus, they aren't allowed to go on the next one. If the school dance gets too rowdy, we cancel the next one."

G. Enablers for Students
"General counseling."

H. Expectations from the Community
"At times, individual parents have overly high expectations."

I. Expectations for the Community
"We have great community support for band, athletics, and other extra-curricular activities."

V. QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

A. Board of Education Commitment
"Although the Board holds high expectations for teachers, we are careful about the limitations of tenure."

B. Policy and Procedures
"none."

C. Expectations for Administrators
"Our biggest problem with principals is teacher evaluation. All of them are "satisfactory" or better. I want more detail; I'd like to see suggestions for improvement; my principals hesitate to tell teachers they're ineffective. They don't want to offend. The new instrument incorporating TRIVET and TESA should help.

D. Expectations for Teachers
"I do expect quality instruction; I feel I have good teachers--well above average. Our inservice efforts are directed toward instructional improvement."

E. Enablers for Teachers
"At least 90% of our inservice is targeted toward quality instruction."

F. Expectations for Students
"None."

G. Enablers for Students
"None."

H. Expectations from the Community
"No real interest in this unless it involves a really bad teacher."

I. Expectations of the Community
"None."

VI. TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

A. Board of Education
"They are aware, but they have had no real involvement."

B. Policy/Procedures
"None."

C. Expectations for Administrators
"We expect them to use TESA behaviors as an informal evaluation system. Subs are provided for TESA training, and I expect each principal to follow up with the teachers who have been trained."

D. Expectations for Teachers
"We intend to have all teachers trained in TESA eventually and to fully implement the system in our district."

E. Enablers for Teachers
"We will provide the training."

F. Expectations for Students
"None."

G. Enablers for Students
"none."

H. Expectations from the Community
"They're concerned about the same teacher expressing two opposing opinions."

I. Expectations of the Community
"No uniform expectations."

VII. SCHOOL CLIMATE

A. Board of Education Commitment
"Safety, order, cleanliness, discipline are high priorities with this Board. The Board President is knowledgeable about physical facilities."

B. Policy/Procedures
"None yet."

C. Expectations for Administrators
"We do expect principals to follow through with any concerns."

D. Expectations for Teachers
"Teachers are expected to have clean, orderly, and attractive classrooms."

E. Enablers for Teachers
"We've had various make-and-takes in the Inservice bulletin."

F. Expectations for Students

"We display student work, have a rotating art show, and try to keep the buildings attractive. There are stringent punishments for vanadalism, and we take legal action where posible. We maintain academic standards for participation in extra-curricular activities. This district maintains an academic rather than athletic focus."

G. Enablers for Students

"Eligibility is a strong motivator."

H. Expectations from the Community

"Our PTAs do all sorts of projects on behalf of physical climate."

I. Expectations of the Community

"School pride issues are more subtle but dealt with; our newsletter uses the 'family' approach.

VIII. PRINCIPAL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

A. Board of Education Commitment

"Definitely. Each principal is totally in charge of his building."

B. Policy/Procedure

"The job descriptions include references to instructional leadership' as do several policies."

C. Expectations for Administrators

"They're definitely in charge. It's their most important role in the district. We expect them to target academic areas for improvement. We expect the principals to know what's going on in their buildings and where they're going in the district. I expect them to set building and professional goals. I expect them to be leaders in classroom instruction and teacher attitude. I prefer more attention to the subjective, especially concerning the attitudes and feelings if staff and students. My dissertation dealt with the principal's effect on teacher morale. I put a great deal of emphasis on the principal making things go in the prescribed direction, not in isolation as if an empire unto himself. I believe in leadership and service, not domination."

D. Expectations for Teachers

"I expect principals to behave in ways to earn teacher respect and allegiance. Their role is to help teachers do a better job.

E. Enablers for Teachers

"Nothing, really."

F. Expectations for Students

"The principal is to behave in ways that earn student respect and confidence; I'd like them to view the principal as another resource or service."

G. Enablers for Students

"None."

H. Expectations from the Community

"There is concern among our parents if the principal doesn't attend everything. They seem to trust them all."

I. Expectations of the Community

"I expect parents to support the principals in disciplinary as well as academic issues. I expect them to be involved and supportive. I'm always candid with them in support of the staff. I admit my contact with parents runs in spurts."

DISTRICT #2

DISTRICT SUMMARY OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

reported as percentage of students scoring at, above, and below anticipated levels of achievement

_____Elementary

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
K							
1							
2							
3							
4	54	49	72	6	11	45	16
5							
6							
TOTAL	54	49	72	6	11	45	16

_____Elementary

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
TOTAL							

_____Elementary

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
TOTAL							

_____Elementary

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
TOTAL							

_____Junior High

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
7							
8							
TOTAL							

_____Junior High

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
7							
8							
TOTAL							

_____High School

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
9							
10							
11							
12							
TOTAL							

SUMMARY

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT ANTICIPATED LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT ANTICIPATED LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE ANTICIPATED LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE ANTICIPATED LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW ANTICIPATED LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW ANTICIPATED LEVEL L.A.
ELEM	54	49	72	6	11	45	16
MIDDLE							
HIGH SCHOOL							
TOTAL	54	49	72	6	11	45	16

DISTRICT #2

DISTRICT SUMMARY OF CLIMATE

reported as percentage of students and teachers feeling positive about any of 8 factors associated with School Climate

FACTORS	EL. #1 ST	EL. #1 TCH	EL. #2 ST	EL. #2 TCH	EL. #3 ST	EL. #3 TCH	EL. #4 ST	EL. #4 TCH	MS #1 ST	MS #1 TCH	MS #2 ST	MS #2 TCH	HS ST	HS TCH	TOTAL ST	TOTAL TCH
1. Classroom practices	78	100													78	100
2. Expectations	98	100													98	100
3. Decision-making	841	100													841	100
4. Discipline/Safety	93	100													93	100
5. Facilities	88	100													88	100
6. Commitment	83	100													83	100
7. Interpersonal Rels.	84	100													84	100
8. Goal Attainment	89	100													89	100

Student N=199
Teacher N= 22

8 indicates areas of concern--50% or fewer positive

DISTRICT SUMMARY OF QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

reported as mean percent for each factor

School Bldg.	PLANNING 6 poss. pts.	BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT 8 poss. pts	ORGANIZA. OF TIME/ SPACE/MAT'S 6 poss. pts	LEARNING CLIMATE 4 poss. pts	STUDENT ASSESSMENT 8 poss. pts	INSTRUC'L TECHNIQUES 14 poss. pts	ORAL/ WRITTEN COMMUNICA. 10 poss. pts	TOTAL 56 poss. pts
EL #1								
EL #2								
EL #3								
EL #4								
MS #1								
MS #2								
HS								
TOTAL								

DISTRICT SUMMARY OF TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

reported as mean rating for each factor

0=rarely evident 1=partially present but inconsistent, sporadic 2=usually present

School Bldg.	RESPONSE OPPORTUNITIES: EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION	INDIVIDUAL HELPING	LATENCY	DELVING	HIGHER LEVEL QUESTIONS	FEEDBACK: AFFIRM/ CORRECT	PRAISE OF LEARNING PERFORMANCE	REASONS FOR PRAISE	LISTENING	ACCEPTANCE OF FEELING	PERSONAL REGARD: PROXIMITY	COURTESY	PERSONAL INTERESTS	TOUCHING	DESISTING	TOTAL
EL #1																
EL #2																
EL #3																
EL #4																
MS #1																
MS #2																
HS																
TOTAL																

DISTRICT #2
RESULTS OF LEADERSHIP SURVEY

FACTORS

I. DECISION MAKING
1-makes clear consistent, fair decisions
10-provides opportunities for teachers to meet
11-conducts productive, well organized staff meetings
13-helps teachers set individual job targets
14-sets building goals/priorities; focuses activities thereon
15-maintains high expectations for teachers
24-includes staff in decision-making
25-maintains consistent, fair, effective discipline

II. CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION
2-has knowledge of district (building) curriculum
3-suggests materials for particular instructional problems
4-suggests alternative materials when preferred choice unavailable
6-is willing to teach classes; will demonstrate/team
7-is willing to take a class for a teacher
12-provides for meaningful inservice
18-directs energies/efforts toward student achievement
20-provides honest, thorough classroom observations
21-observes variety of class periods at various times of year
22-makes valid suggestions to improve classroom instruction
23-encourages/facilitates variety in classroom instruction

III. PRESENCE/VISIBILITY
5-maintains visibility in buildings; knows all students
8-is willing to assist teachers with duties
17-maintains high expectations for students; monitors student progress
19-recognizes student success
26-backs staff members in discipline situations
27-maintains effective parent/community relations
28-demonstrates school pride in and out of the school setting
29-attends most school functions

IV. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS
9-encourages collegiality among teachers and other staff members
16-acknowledges staff accomplishments; encourages staff growth
30-is sensitive to individual needs and concerns

Actual results begin on next page.

Principal's Name:_____ Building_____

DECISION-MAKING

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
1	5	33	33	29	-
10	5	5	33	48	10
11	-	5	43	43	10
13	10	29	38	24	-
14	-	5	24	43	29
15	-	10	19	52	19
24	5	14	43	24	14
25	19	38	29	10	0
TOTAL	5.5	17	33	34	10

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

QUESTION NO.	EXT. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
2	-	-	10	38	52
3	-	19	38	30	5
4	-	24	48	24	5
6	-	29	29	24	19
7	5	29	24	29	14
12	-	5	48	43	5
18	-	10	38	33	14
20	-	14	57	19	10
21	19	19	33	29	-
22	-	19	48	24	-
23	-	14	29	43	14
TOTAL	2	17	37	31	13

PRESENCE/VISIBILITY

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
5	-	-	5	38	57
8	-	-	10	62	29
17	-	14	43	33	10
19	-	5	14	52	29
26	5	19	48	19	10
27	-	5	19	33	43
28	-	-	5	43	52
29	-	-	-	29	71
TOTAL	.5	5	18	39	38

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
9	-	24	38	24	5
16	10	14	29	24	24
30	-	10	24	38	29
TOTAL	3	16	30	29	19

DISTRICT #2

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS REPORT

(Summary of Interview with Superintendent)

	Evidence of Commitment	I Outcome-Based Education	II Student Potential	III Attendance	IV Student Attitude	V Quality of Instruction	VI Teacher Expectations	VII School Climate	VIII Principal as Instructional Leader	TOTAL
A	Commitment by Board of Education	1	1	1		1	1	1	1	7/8
B	Policy/Procedures	1	1	1	1	1			1	6/8
C	Expectations for Administrators	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	7/8
D	Expectations for Teachers	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8/8
E	Enablers for Teachers (inservice, etc.)	1	1		1	1	1		1	6/8
F	Expectations for Students	1	1	1	1		1	1		6/8
G	Enablers for Students (intervention, etc.)	1	1	1	1		1	1	1	7/8
H	Expectations from Community (theirs of you)	1	1			1		1	1	5/8
I	Expectations of Community (what you count on from them)	1	1			1		1		4/8
	TOTAL	9/9 *	9/9 *	6/9 *	6/9 *	7/9 *	5/9 *	7/9 *	7/9 *	

1-indicates specific evidence of actual commitment

*indicates factor for which actual commitment is evident; at least 5 of 9 points

SEE ATTACHED SHEETS FOR DETAILED NARRATIVE

DISTRICT #2

Summary of District's Commitment to the Effective Schools Correlates

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS

(Principals responses to interview questions concerning Board Policy and expectations of school personnel)

I. OUTCOME BASED EDUCATION

A. Board of Education Commitment

Board commitment exists

B. Policy/Procedures

Policy exists - a statement regarding CBE is in policies
County Board has mandated CBE
CBE exists in Reading and math, writing to be implemented 87-88

C. Expectations for Administrators

Superintendent wants to know what Principals are doing regarding CBE and how they are doing it

D. Expectations for Teachers

Teachers are to assess in terms of specific objectives
In addition to district-wide test there is to be ongoing assessment of objectives
Teachers are to know students deficiencies and work to correct these
Maps of when objectives are taught are required and record of when objectives are actually taught are kept
Principal looks for evidence of CBE in classroom observations

E. Enablers for Teachers

County and district level meetings address CBE
In Building grade level meetings:
teachers identify which items are to be mastery items
teachers keep principal appraised of any difficulty meeting COS
ongoing communication between principal and teacher

F. Expectations for Students

Expectations for objectives are translated to the kids
Competency tests and standardized test are given to assess student achievement

G. Enablers for Students

Intervention procedures are in place for math and reading
Teachers pick up missing skills in the Course of Study through remediation
Principal monitors and responds to student's achievement
Discipline plan is in place - rewards are developed

H. Expectations from the Community

Parent input into goals of the schools - one of the goals is CBE
Parents have high expectations for Bolivar Elementary

I. Expectations of the Community

Financial support is low
Help with goal setting

II. STUDENT POTENTIAL

Board of Education Commitment

Board commitment exists

B. Policy/Procedures

Student potential is addressed in the district's goal statements

C. Expectations for Administrators

Superintendent has addressed effective schools in newsletter
Goals established by superintendent:
- set high expectations
- exert pressure to perform
- take no excuses for poor performance

Superintendent will look for adherence to these goals in Principal's evaluation

D. Expectations for Teachers

Superintendent has established clear direction regarding teacher performance and has removed ineffective teachers
During classroom observations principal looks for; children on task, discipline, teacher-student talk time, time spent beginning lessons, use of concrete referents, review of previous day, assessment and closure of lesson, transitions ,

E. Enablers for Teachers

Principal meets once a month with staff to discuss various topics
e.g. grading, assignment of children, behavioral problems, organizational structure
teachers identify which items are to be mastery items
teachers keep principal appraised of any difficulty meeting COS
ongoing communication between principal and teacher
Principal help teachers maximize teaching time
Principal helps provide for enrichment
Surveys are sent to staff for responses to special programs

F. Expectations for Students

It is expected that students achieve to potential

G. Enablers for Students

Honors program
Citizenship award
Hard working award
Most cooperative children awards
Academic fitness awards
Outstanding student awards for academics and service
Surveys are sent to students for response to special programs

H. Expectations from the Community

Parents have high expectations for students at Bolivar elementary

I. Expectations of the Community

Surveys are sent to parents for responses to special programs

III. ATTENDANCE

A. Board of Education Commitment

Board Commitment exists

B. Policy/Procedures

Policy asks that a note or phone call be provided when a student is absent

C. Expectations for Administrators

Superintendent expects Principal to monitor attendance and take action before twenty days of student absence

D. Expectations for Teachers

Teachers are to appraise principal of attendance problems
Teachers are to provide materials and assignments for missing students

E. Enablers for Teachers

F. Expectations for Students

Statement in student handbook stating that regular and punctual attendance is expected

G. Enablers for Students

Perfect attendance award

IV. STUDENT ATTITUDE

A. Board of Education Commitment

No Board statement regarding the affective domain exists

B. Policy/Procedures

District philosophy addresses individual differences, critical and creative thinking, ethical principles and values

C. Expectations for Administrators

Principal is evaluated on work with troubled children/families
Superintendent has made a clear statement that Principal demonstrate care for kids

D. Expectations for Teachers

Superintendent has made a clear statement that teachers are to work with troubled students
Principal expects teachers to be child advocates, to like and care about children

E. Enablers for Teachers

Principal provides meetings regarding reluctant learners
Principal helps in matching up kids in classes, teachers have input into class assignments
Principal provides information to teachers to study about children's interests, strengths, weaknesses

F. Expectations for Students

Policies are outlined regarding discipline, drug use rights, etc.

G. Enablers for Students

Principal meets regularly with students

H. Expectations from the Community

I. Expectations of the Community

V. QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

A. Board of Education Commitment

Most board members are committed to academics and high student achievement

B. Policy/Procedures

Policy exists through statement of desired outcome goals

C. Expectations for Administrators

Principals are to provide specific suggestions for classroom management and improving specific areas of instruction

D. Expectations for Teachers

Teachers are to provide quality instruction for all students

E. Enablers for Teachers

On going inservice at the County level;
subject area methods
drug education, sex education strategies
modalities
what to do for high level students
make and take workshops
incorporating art, music into lessons

F. Expectations for Students

G. Enablers for Students

H. Expectations from the Community

Parent observations of classrooms are available but few take advantage

I. Expectations of the Community

Parents provide materials for teachers
Parent volunteers to tutor students

VI. TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

A. Board of Education Commitment

Board is committed to academics for all students

B. Policy/Procedures

No formal policy in place

C. Expectations for Administrators

D. Expectations for Teachers

All ability students are to be considered and to learn
Expectations are to be in line with student abilities

E. Enablers for Teachers

Special education coordinator provides in-service about mainstreamed children
Resource teachers maintain on-going contact with classroom teachers

F. Expectations for Students

Students are expected to be in school, work to their ability

G. Enablers for Students

Rewards for positive achievement

H. Expectations from the Community

None

I Expectations of the Community

None

VII. SCHOOL CLIMATE

A. Board of Education Commitment

Board is committed to an academic climate in the schools

B. Policy/Procedures

No formal policies

C. Expectations for Administrators

Superintendent has provided an emphasis on positive climate

D. Expectations for Teachers

Superintendent has set high expectations for staff about academic climate

E. Enablers for Teachers

None in place yet

F. Expectations for Students

Students are expected to attend school regularly and work to ability

G. Enablers for Students

Rewards for positive effort/achievement

H. Expectations from the Community

Traditional definition that the community is part of the school

I Expectations of the Community

Provide opportunities for students e.g. students go to senior citizen meetings to do things for them

VIII: PRINCIPAL AS INSTRUCTIONAL LEADER

A. Board of Education Commitment

Board and Superintendent are committed to the principal running the building

B. Policy/Procedures

No specific policy directly addresses this but is part of evaluation

C. Expectations for Administrators

Principals job description is to be team leader in building - principal is to make;
written recommendations regarding curriculum
establish building guidelines
assist in the development of new staff
maintain records on students

D. Expectations for Teachers

Staff is to cooperate with the principal on projects

E. Enablers for Teachers

Principal is to be visible and in classrooms, Superintendent believes in MBWA

F. Expectations for Students

None

G. Enablers for Students

About 30% of a principals time is spent on curriculum and instructional matters

H. Expectations from the Community

Community expects principal to be instructional leader in the building
Principal communicates academic and other matters to the community through newsletter.

I. Expectations of the Community

DISTRICT SUMMARY OF STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

reported as percentage of students scoring at, above, and below anticipated levels of achievement

_____ Elementary

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
K							
1							
2							
3							
4	14	14	50	71	43	14	7
5							
6							
TOTAL	14	14	50	71	43	14	7

_____ Elementary

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
TOTAL							

_____ Elementary

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
TOTAL							

_____ Elementary

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
K							
1							
2							
3							
4							
5							
6							
TOTAL							

_____ Junior High

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
7							
8							
TOTAL							

_____ Junior High

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
7							
8							
TOTAL							

_____ High School

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW LEVEL L.A.
9							
10	9/11	33	55	33	36	33	10
11							
12							
TOTAL	9/11	33	55	33	36	33	10

SUMMARY

Grade Level	N	PERCENT AT ANTICIPATED LEVEL MATH	PERCENT AT ANTICIPATED LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT ABOVE ANTICIPATED LEVEL MATH	PERCENT ABOVE ANTICIPATED LEVEL L.A.	PERCENT BELOW ANTICIPATED LEVEL MATH	PERCENT BELOW ANTICIPATED LEVEL L.A.
ELEM	14	14	50	71	43	14	7
MIDDLE							
HIGH SCHOOL	9/11	33	55	33	36	33	10
TOTAL	25	24	53	52	40	24	9

DISTRICT #3

DISTRICT SUMMARY OF CLIMATE

reported as percentage of students and teachers feeling positive about any of 8 factors associated with School Climate

FACTORS	EL #1		EL #2		EL #3		EL #4		MS #1		MS #2		HS		TOTAL	
	ST	TCH	ST	TCH	ST	TCH	ST	TCH	ST	TCH	ST	TCH	ST	TCH	ST	TCH
1. Classroom practices	95	100	97	93	94	100	93	100	94	100	94			100	95	99
2. Expectations	98	100	99	100	97	100	93	100	100	100	98			100	88	100
3. Decision-making	88	100	90	100	80	89	87	100	79	100	76			100	82	98
4. Discipline/Safety	96	100	97	100	94	100	92	100	99	100	98			100	91	100
5. Facilities	90	100	91	100	84	100	78	100	93	100	88			100	88	100
6. Commitment	96	100	97	100	82	100	95	100	88	100	95			100	94	100
7. Interpersonal Rels.	95	100	98	100	92	100	98	100	93	100	95			100	95	100
8. Goal Attainment	93	100	99	100	95	100	95	100	99	100	97			100	96	100
Student	N=225		N=150		N=204		N=80		N=88		N=83				N=790	
Teacher	N= 5		N= 15		N= 9		N= 3		N= 4				N=23		N= 59	

* indicates areas of concern--50% or fewer positive

DISTRICT SUMMARY OF QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

reported as mean percent for each factor

School Bldg.	PLANNING 6 poss. pts.	BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT 8 poss. pts	ORGANIZA. OF TIME/ SPACE/MAT'S 6 poss. pts	LEARNING CLIMATE 4 poss. pts	STUDENT ASSESSMENT 8 poss. pts	INSTRUC'L TECHNIQUES 14 poss. pts	ORAL/ WRITTEN COMMUNICA. 10 poss. pts	TOTAL 56 poss. pts
EL #1								
EL #2								
EL #3								
EL #4								
MS #1								
MS #2								
HS								
TOTAL								

DISTRICT SUMMARY OF TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

reported as mean rating for each factor

0=rarely evident 1=partially present but inconsistent, sporadic 2=usually present

School Bldg.	RESPONSE OPPORTUNITIES						FEEDBACK						PERSONAL REGARD					TOTAL
	EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION	INDIVIDUAL HELPING	LATENCY	DELVING	HIGHER LEVEL QUESTIONS		AFFIRM/ CORRECT	PRAISE OF LEARNING PERFORMANCE	REASONS FOR PRAISE	LISTENING	ACCEPTANCE OF FEELING		PROXIMITY	COURTESY	PERSONAL INTERESTS	TOUCHING	DESISTING	
EL #1																		
EL #2																		
EL #3																		
EL #4																		
MS #1																		
MS #2																		
HS																		
TOTAL																		

DISTRICT #3

RESULTS OF LEADERSHIP SURVEY

FACTORS

I. DECISION MAKING
- 1-makes clear consistent, fair decisions
- 10-provides opportunities for teachers to meet
- 11-conducts productive, well organized staff meetings
- 13-helps teachers set individual job targets
- 14-sets building goals/priorities; focuses activities thereon
- 15-maintains high expectations for teachers
- 24-includes staff in decision-making
- 25-maintains consistent, fair, effective discipline

II. CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION
- 2-has knowledge of district (building) curriculum
- 3-suggests materials for particular instructional problems
- 4-suggests alternative materials when preferred choice unavailable
- 6-is willing to teach classes; will demonstrate/team
- 7-is willing to take a class for a teacher
- 12-provides for meaningful inservice
- 18-directs energies/efforts toward student achievement
- 20-provides honest, thorough classroom observations
- 21-observes variety of class periods at various times of year
- 22-makes valid suggestions to improve classroom instruction
- 23-encourages/facilitates variety in classroom instruction

III. PRESENCE/VISIBILITY
- 5-maintains visibility in buildings; knows all students
- 8-is willing to assist teachers with duties
- 17-maintains high expectations for students; monitors student progress
- 19-recognizes student success
- 26-backs staff members in discipline situations
- 27-maintains effective parent/community relations
- 28-demonstrates school pride in and out of the school setting
- 29-attends most school functions

IV. INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS
- 9-encourages collegiality among teachers and other staff members
- 16-acknowledges staff accomplishments; encourages staff growth
- 30-is sensitive to individual needs and concerns

Actual results begin on next page.

Principal's Name:_____ Building_____

DECISION-MAKING

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
1	-	-	-	100	-
10	-	-	-	75	25
11	-	-	-	100	-
13	-	-	50	50	-
14	-	-	25	75	-
15	-	-	-	75	25
24	-	-	75	25	-
25	-	-	25	75	-
TOTAL	-	-	22	72	8

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

QUESTION NO.	EXT. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
2	-	-	25	75	-
3	-	-	25	75	-
4	-	-	25	50	25
6	-	-	25	50	25
7	-	-	25	75	-
12	-	-	50	50	-
18	-	-	25	50	25
20	-	-	50	50	-
21	-	-	-	100	-
22	-	-	25	50	25
23	-	-	50	25	25
TOTAL	-	-	30	59	11

PRESENCE/VISIBILITY

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
5	-	-	-	75	25
8	-	25	-	25	50
17	-	-	-	75	25
19	-	-	-	75	25
26	-	-	-	75	25
27	-	-	-	50	50
28	-	-	-	50	50
29	-	-	-	-	100
TOTAL	-	3	-	53	44

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
9	-	-	-	75	25
16	-	-	-	75	25
30	-	-	-	25	75
TOTAL	-	-	-	58	42

Principal's Name_____ Building_____

DECISION-MAKING

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
1	-	-	-	33	67
10	-	33	-	67	-
11	-	-	-	-	100
13	-	-	33	33	33
14	-	-	-	33	67
15	-	-	-	-	100
24	-	-	33	67	-
25	-	-	-	33	67
TOTAL	-	4	8	33	54

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

QUESTION NO.	EXT. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
2	-	-	-	-	100
3	-	-	-	67	33
4	-	-	-	100	-
6	-	33	-	33	33
7	33	-	-	-	67
12	-	-	33	33	33
18	-	-	-	-	100
20	-	-	-	33	67
21	-	-	-	100	-
22	-	-	-	100	-
23	-	-	-	100	-
TOTAL	3	3	3	51	39

PRESENCE/VISIBILITY

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
5	-	-	33	33	33
8	-	33	-	-	67
17	-	-	-	67	33
19	-	-	-	-	100
26	-	33	-	-	67
27	-	-	-	33	67
28	-	-	-	-	100
29	-	-	-	-	100
TOTAL	-	8	4	17	71

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
9	-	-	33	33	33
16	-	-	-	33	67
30	-	-	-	33	67
TOTAL	-	-	11	33	56

Principal's Name_____ Building_____

DECISION-MAKING

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
1	11	44	44	-	-
10	22	11	56	11	-
11	33	44	11	11	-
13	-	56	11	33	-
14	-	33	22	44	-
15	11	-	56	33	-
24	13	38	25	-	25
25	25	25	38	13	-
TOTAL	14	31	33	18	3

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

QUESTION NO.	EXT. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
2	-	22	56	11	11
3	22	44	22	11	-
4	33	44	11	11	-
6	33	11	22	33	-
7	11	-	44	22	22
12	22	22	56	-	-
18	-	22	33	33	11
20	-	22	33	33	11
21	44	11	11	33	-
22	22	22	44	11	-
23	11	22	44	22	-
TOTAL	19	21	36	19	4

PRESENCE/VISIBILITY

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
5	11	-	11	33	44
8	-	-	33	33	33
17	11	11	67	11	-
19	-	11	33	56	-
26	13	25	38	25	-
27	13	13	25	38	13
28	13	-	38	50	-
29	13	-	-	50	33
TOTAL	9	9	31	36	16

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
9	11	33	-	33	22
16	11	-	56	33	-
30	14	14	14	14	43
TOTAL	12	16	23	27	22

Principal's Name_____ Building_____

DECISION-MAKING

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
1	-	4	26	48	22
10	-	9	35	44	13
11	-	9	26	48	17
13	-	17	39	35	9
14	-	4	26	61	13
15	-	-	17	48	35
24	-	9	22	48	22
25	-	4	35	39	22
TOTAL	-	7	28	48	19

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

QUESTION NO.	EXT. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
2	-	4	13	69	17
3	-	4	26	39	30
4	-	13	61	26	-
6	22	22	22	22	13
7	4	13	22	39	22
12	17	13	35	21	13
18	-	4	36	61	9
20	4	4	35	35	22
21	4	17	52	22	4
22	-	17	30	39	13
23	-	9	35	44	13
TOTAL	5	11	32	38	14

PRESENCE/VISIBILITY

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
5	-	9	22	39	35
8	-	13	4	57	26
17	-	4	35	52	9
19	-	-	17	57	26
26	-	4	13	44	39
27	-	4	17	48	30
28	-	-	9	22	70
29	-	-	17	9	74
TOTAL	-	4	17	39	40

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
9	-	4	22	39	33
16	-	-	9	64	27
30	-	5	9	32	55
TOTAL	-	3	13	45	39

Principal's Name_____ Building_____

DECISION-MAKING

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
1	7	27	27	40	-
10	-	-	40	33	27
11	-	20	27	33	20
13	7	-	47	27	20
14	-	13	20	27	40
15	-	-	20	47	33
24	13	27	20	40	-
25	7	-	27	53	13
TOTAL	4	11	29	36	19

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

QUESTION NO.	EXT. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
2	13	-	7	67	13
3	7	27	33	27	7
4	7	27	33	33	-
6	-	-	27	60	13
7	-	-	20	60	20
12	-	40	27	20	13
18	-	14	21	43	21
20	7	-	33	40	20
21	-	7	27	53	13
22	-	33	20	33	13
23	-	-	40	52	7
TOTAL	3	13	26	44	13

PRESENCE/VISIBILITY

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
5	-	-	7	67	27
8	-	13	40	40	7
17	-	-	20	73	7
19	-	-	20	60	13
26	-	-	33	20	47
27	7	7	13	73	-
28	-	-	13	60	27
29	-	-	47	53	
TOTAL	1	2	19	55	23

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
9	7	20	20	20	33
16	-	7	20	40	33
30	-	27	27	20	27
TOTAL	2	18	22	27	31

Principal's Name_____ Builind_____

DECISION-MAKING

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
1	-	-	20	80	-
10	-	-	40	60	-
11	-	2-	-	60	20
13	-	-	40	60	-
14	-	20	20	40	20
15	-	-	-	100	-
24	-	-	20	60	20
25	-	-	-	60	20
TOTAL	-	5	17	65	12.5

CURRICULUM/INSTRUCTION

QUESTION NO.	EXT. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG.	EXEMP/SUP'R
2	-	-	40	60	0
3	-	-	60	40	-
4	-	20	60	20	-
6	-	-	-	60	40
7	-	-	-	40	60
12	-	-	40	60	-
18	-	-	-	40	60
20	-	-	40	60	0
21	-	20	-	80	-
22	-	-	40	6-	-
23	-	20	40	40	-
TOTAL	-	5	29	56	9

PRESENCE/VISIBILITY

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
5	-	-	-	80	20
8	-	-	-	60	40
17	-	-	20	80	-
19	-	-	20	80	-
26	-	-	-	60	40
27	-	-	-	60	40
28	-	-	-	80	20
29	-	-	-	60	40
TOTAL	-	-	5	70	25

INTERPERSONAL RELATIONS

QUESTION NO.	EXTR. POOR	RATHER WEAK	ADEQUATE	STRONG	EXEMP/SUP'R
9	-	-	-	80	20
16	-	-	-	80	20
30	-	-	-	60	40
TOTAL	-	-	-	73	27

DISTRICT #3

INSTITUTIONAL GOALS REPORT

(Summary of Interview with Superintendent)

	Evidence of Commitment	I Outcome-Based Education	II Student Potential	III Attendance	IV Student Attitude	V Quality of Instruction	VI Teacher Expectations	VII School Climate	VIII Principal as Instructional Leader	TOTAL
A	Commitment by Board of Education	1	1	1	1	1	1		1	7/8
B	Policy/Procedures	1	1	1		1	1		1	6/8
C	Expectations for Administrators	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8/8
D	Expectations for Teachers	1	1		1	1	1		1	6/8
E	Enablers for Teachers (inservice, etc.)	1	1		1	1	1		1	6/8
F	Expectations for Students	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	7/8
G	Enablers for Students (intervention, etc.)	1	1		1	1	1	1	1	7/8
H	Expectations from Community (theirs of you)	1		1		1	1	1		5/8
I	Expectations of Community (what you count on from them)	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	8/8
	TOTAL	9/9 *	8/9 *	5/9 *	7/9	9/9 *	9/9	5/9 *	8/9	5/8

1-indicates specific evidece of actual commitmet

*indicates factor for which actual commitment is evident

SEE ATTACHED SHEETS FOR DETAILED NARRATIVE

DISTRICT #3

Summary of District's Commitmet to the Effectivew Schools Correlates

INSTITUTIONAL GOAS

I. OUTCOME-BASED EDUCATION

A. Board of Education Commitment

The district has a Computer-Based Education Policy and a Council for Academic Excellence

B. Policy/Procedures

There are specific procedures for the Competency-Based Education policy

C. Expectations for Administrators

The district uses a Management By Objectives system for administrative job description; their annual evaluations are tied to student test results, and their salary increases are tied to various Effective Schools activities required of them each year

D. Expectations for Teachers

Each building has a "High Expectations Committee" of Teachers to identify various activities and techniques to increase student achievement. Teachers are encouraged to be more cognizant of the self-fulfilling prophecy.

E. Enablers (inservice) for Teachers

There are several local contests (such as those sponsored by the PTA) to encourage students to work harder. The math achievement scores are lower than we would like, so students participate in jump-a-thons, etc. to raise scores

F. Expectations for Students

We have building-level intervention teams to work with specific student problems. Additionally, there is a District Governing Board that considers district level intervention plans at its meetings two or three times each month. We use a computerized checklist for intervention; once problems are identified, the computer generates strategies for the classroom teacher to use.

G. Enablers for Students

This year is the first that the community has demonstrated any kind of interest without solicitation. By community request, we have held presentations to explain the expectations for incoming first graders. Other similar explanations are being scheduled.

H. Expectations from the Community

We expect involvement and a realistic expectation on their part of the district's needs. For example, how much it will actually cost to equip all classroom with computers. We continually try to help them grow in their perspective.

II. STUDENT POTENTIAL

A. Board of Education Commitment

The Board has funded a Gifted program for several years; we have a pull-out at grades 4-6 and self-contained units in 7-12. They have a strong belief in the importance of students achieving at their highest possible levels. Their support of the Effective Schools and Excellence programs and their continued insistence that student test scores can improve support their beliefs.

B. Policy/Procedures

All students can be expected--and are expected--to reach their fullest potential academically, vocationally, and avocationally. This is demonstrated in the various CBE, intervention, and Gifted policies and still being developed.

C. Expectations for Administrators

The principals have as one of their primary job targets the improvement of standardized test scores. Every nine weeks, they are to list the activities they have facilitated to upgrade and improve student achievement.

D. Expectations for Teachers

We have made a concerted effort to work on teacher attitude. There are no "can'ts" and indeed are more "wills" than "won'ts" among students. The glass is half-full, not half-empty. Each building has adopted its own mission statement including the issue of students reaching their potential. We are managing to foster high expectations among teachers without administrative prompting.

E. Enablers for Teachers

We provide the elementary teachers release time each year to look at test scores; we one half day to interpret results and one half day to plan intervention. Our intervention involves acceleration as well as remediation. For secondary teachers, the guidance counselors provide in-service on test results, and the County Office offers sessions on intervention

F. Expectations for Students

Students are expected to continue to try to improve, regardless of their abilities on previous achievement. They are encouraged to go (and reinforced for going) the extra mile.

G. Enablers for Students

The district has applied for sex equity money to bring in speakers to show our girls female professional role models. We have a full-time career-education coordinator who uses shadowing by community members and teachers. We provide extensive intervention programs.

H. Expectations from the Community

Community expectations are far lower than we feel is fair or appropriate.

I. Expectations of the Community

The district is continuing to try to build the district's self-concept. There has been too much "We are not Shaker Heights." We plan to continue to expect the district to keep pace with technological changes and societal demands. There is a prevailing concern that our students may not "survive" the pressures they will face once out of school.

III. ATTENDANCE

A. Board of Education Commitment

The Board has instituted In-School Suspension and Saturday School for truant and tardy students. There is an all out commitment to keep students in school.

B. Policy and Procedures

There are several policies and procedures governing attendance.

C. Expectations for Administrators

Principals are expected to follow up on attendance problems. Pregnant girls are expected to stay in school. We are involved in a grant with the JVS to encourage this and to teach basic motherhood.

D. Expectations for Teachers

None, really.

E. Enablers for Teachers

No.

F. Expectations for Students

I'm afraid it's been more reactive than preventive.

G. Enablers for Students

Just a series of carefully detailed expectations and consequences.

H. Expectations from the Community

They have the traditional values; they want their children to be in school.

I. Expectations for the Community

We make a lot of contacts with parents; we send follow-up letters, quarterly reports, and other updates as needed.

IV. STUDENT ATTITUDE

A. Board of Education Commitment

Definitely

B. Policy/Procedures

We actually have more of these in personnel practices. For example, the criteria for hiring the last high school principal included someone to work with school spirit.

C. Expectations for Administrators

Student attitude is included in our MBO system. One of the sub-committees in each building is the "Attitude Toward Learning" committee. It meets every 9 weeks to plan various programs to reward positive student attitudes, improved cafeteria behavior, etc.

D. Expectations for Teachers

Teacher personality in working with students is part of the teacher appraisal system. It is expected that teachers will refrain from being grumpy. teachers in the district have been released because of performance and attitude problems.

E. Enablers for Teachers

We have a professional growth track, wherein teachers may opt to attend inservice on various aspects of student attitude.

F. Expectations for Students

There are plans, rules, and consequences widely circulated.

G. Enablers for Students

The intervention team includes behaviors and attitudes.

H. Expectations from the Community

These are there but very unsophisticated and informal, much less than we like to see.

I. Expectations for the Community

We expect them to be knowledgeable about factors that contribute to positive and negative attitudes. There has been increased participation in parent meetings, and it appears that people are finally reading our written communications.

V. QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

A. Board of Education Commitment

In their hiring practices, the Board always wants us to hold out for the best person.

B. Policy and Procedures

Generically.

C. Expectations for Administrators

There is a great deal of pressure on the principals, really. They are required to implement the Effective Schools correlates, provide clinical supervision, and make frequent classroom visits. Actually, they're not expected to answer their phones when someone calls--they're to be in classrooms. I look at each teacher appraisal they write, and I've really been disappointed at the level of prescription they've included. We're placing more emphasis on prescriptive strategies, trying to incorporate the Hunter strategies, and working in concert with the union.

D. Expectations for Teachers

We expect them to be thorough! Our teachers are challenged when too many students fail. When it's the usual distribution, we keep hands off; when it's noticeably skewed, we take a good look.

E. Enablers for Teachers

We provide extensive inservice on various topics teachers say they need and we feel they need. We have formal programs of teacher intervention. For example, we send teachers who are having discipline problems to the Cleveland State Discipline Center to learn techniques and strategies to improve classroom management.

F. Expectations for Students

Each elementary has a High Expectation Board. Students are expected to cooperate with their classroom teachers and participate in all classroom activities.

G. Enablers for Students

Nothing, really.

H. Expectations from the Community

While they do expect quality, their expectations are really based on their own experiences and are somewhat limited. We keep trying to raise their levels of expectations.

I. Expectations of the Community

We keep wishing they would expect more and become more knowledgeable about such things as the "In-progress grades."

VI. TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

[She felt same responses would apply as were given for Quality of Instruction. Their major thrust in these areas is to have teachers feel more optimistic about student potential: the glass half-full' business.]

VII. CLIMATE

A. Board of Education Commitment

Nothing really.

B. Policy/Procedures

Nothing.

C. Expectations for Administrators

Since climate is one of the 7 elements of Effective Schools, there is a committee in each building to deal with problems and concerns about School Climate.

D. Expectations for Teachers

None.

E. Enablers for Teachers

None.

F. Expectations for Students

We have several behavioral expectations of students. They are to conduct themselves as good citizens, dress neatly, treat others and school property with respect, and so on.

G. Enablers for Students

We try all sorts of things to encourage students and to reinforce them for good behavior.

H. Expectations from the Community

Ours is an old-fashioned community. They value discipline, order, manners, cleanliness, and respect for elders. That's helpful whey trying to establish and maintain effective learning climate.

I. Expectations of the Community

We have none as such. We do need and want their support. When a student is sent home with a bare midriff or green hair, we don't expect the parent to send the child right back to school unchanged. So far, we have been extremely lucky.

VIII. INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP

A. Board of Education Commitment

Absolutely. As I mentioned earlier, they insist on this frame of reference for recruitment and hiring.

B. Policy/Procedures

This is almost overly done. If a Board Member walked into a principal's office to complain about an LD math book, and the principal did not know the book in question, the Board Member would be upset.

C. Expectations for Adminstrators

This is very clinically spelled out. They are required to know and encourage the use of Hunter [there are 14 teachers in the district trained in Hunter with whom the principals are to network other teachers] and the 7 elements of Effective Schools. They attend teacher training workshops and are expected to know as much about the program as the teachers do.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

D. Expectations for Teachers

--Very high. Teachers are to clear every major instructional change with the principal. For example, one teacher wanted to try teaching math once day each week. She was permitted to try it, and it failed. The principal made the determination to discontinue the idea. All teachers are expected to honor the requests and directives of their principal, and they know that. Insubordination is not condoned.

E. Enablers for Teachers

Since the teachers and principal are co-trained in the various instructional programs, teachers see the principal as a partner or ally in the overall picture. Many of the principals teach on a regular basis; they are required to put themselves in situations where they too are teachers.

F. Expectations for Students

Our students realize that the principals make frequent classroom visits, are involved in curriculum and intervention projects, can and do teach, and attend workshops with the teachers. [We no longer have to contend with the principal as ex-jock stereotype.]

G. Enablers for Students

Same as above.

H. Expectations from the Community

Yes, but broader than that. Their perception is that Instructional leadership involves discipline and order as the first priority. We're trying to expand those perceptions to include actual instructional leadership.

I. Expectations of the Community

We would like the community to be more seriously concerned with academic and instructional issues than with paperwork and discipline. We tell our principals to miss paper deadlines and get into classrooms. This means they may not return [parent] phone calls promptly.

Percentage of Students Within Percentile Ranges for Aptitude

DISTRICT #1

Grade 4 Mathematics

Percentile Ranges	Males			Females			TOTAL		
	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above
99-90	3	12	3	3	16	3	3	14	2
89-80	-	3	6	-	2	11	-	2	9
79-70	-	6	6	3	8	8	2	7	7
69-60	6	-	-	2	5	3	3	3	2
59-50	3	6	6	-	3	3	1	4	4
49-40	3	-	-	2	2	3	2	1	2
39-30	6	-	6	3	2	-	4	1	2
29-20	9	-	-	2	5	3	4	3	2
19-10	6	3	3	2	3	5	3	2	4
9- 0	3	-	-	2	2	-	2	1	-
Total	33	32	30	17	45	38	24	41	35
	N=34			N=64			N=98		

Grade 4 Language Arts

Percentile Ranges	Males			Females			TOTAL		
	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above
99-90	-	14	-	3	17	3	2	16	2
89-80	-	6	3	2	2	11	1	3	8
79-70	3	6	-	3	8	8	3	7	5
69-60	3	3	-	9	-	-	7	1	-
59-50	3	6	3	2	-	6	1	2	5
49-40	3	-	-	2	-	3	2	-	2
39-30	6	-	6	-	-	5	3	-	2
29-20	11	6	-	-	2	5	4	3	3
19-10	3	-	14	-	-	8	1	-	10
9- 0	3	-	-	2	-	2	2	-	1
Total	39	40	26	22	28	50	26	32	41
	N=35			N=64			N=99		

Percentage of Students Within Percentile Ranges for Aptitude

DISTRICT #1

Grade 7 Mathematics

Percentile Ranges	Males			Females			TOTAL		
	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above
99-90	-	14	2	3	20	3	3	34	5
89-80	7	2	7	-	14	-	7	16	7
79-70	5	9	2	3	6	-	8	15	2
69-60	2	-	-	6	-	3	8	-	5
59-50	2	7	2	6	-	-	8	7	2
49-40	5	2	-	3	3	3	8	5	3
39-30	5	5	5	3	-	3	8	8	8
29-20	5	2	5	3	3	6	8	5	11
19-10	-	-	2	-	3	-	6	3	2
9- 0	-	-	-	-	3	-	-	3	-
Total	30	42	28	31	51	17	32	33	36
	N=43			N=35			N=78		

Grade 7 Language Arts

Percentile Ranges	Males			Females			TOTAL		
	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above
99-90	2	-	4	3	6	17	1	17	3
89-80	7	5	5	-	3	9	4	8	4
79-70	11	5	-	-	3	3	4	8	1
69-60	5	-	-	6	3	-	4	-	3
59-50	5	5	-	6	3	-	4	4	1
49-40	5	2	-	3	-	6	4	3	1
39-30	2	11	2	3	3	3	4	3	5
29-20	2	2	7	-	6	6	4	3	1
19-10		2	2	3	6	-	3	1	-
9- 0	-	-	-	-	-	3	-	1	-
Total	39	32	30	24	33	47	32	48	19
	N=44			N=35			N=78		

Percentage of Students Within Percentile Ranges for Aptitude

District #1

Grade 10 Language Arts

Percentile Ranges	Males			Females			TOTAL		
	Below	At	ABOVE	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above
99-90	1	-	1	-	31	-	-	21	-
89-80	25	-	-	-	-	-	8	-	-
79-70	-	-	-	6	-	-	4	-	-
69-60	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
59-50	-	12.5	-	-	6	6	-	8	4
49-40	-	-	-	6	6	-	4	4	-
39-30	12.5	-	12.5	12	6	6	12	4	8
29-20	-	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	4	-
19-10	12.5	-	-	-	-	-	4	-	-
9- 0	-	12.5	-	6	-	-	4	4	-
Total	50	38	12.5	38	50	12	42	46	12
	N= 8			N=16			N=24		

Percentage of Students Within Percentile Ranges for Aptitude

DISTRICT #2

Grade 4 Mathematics

Percentile Ranges	Males			Females			TOTAL		
	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above
99-90	7	-	-	12	-	-	9	-	-
89-80	4	14	-	12	-	-	8	8	-
79-70	11	14	-	8	16	-	9	15	-
69-60	4	11	4	12	4	-	13	8	2
59-50	7	11	-	-	4	-	4	8	-
49-40	4	4	-	8	8	-	6	6	-
39-30	-	-	4	-	8	-	-	-	2
29-20	-	-	-	4	-	-	-	-	-
19-10	-	4	-	-	-	4	-	2	-
9- 0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
Total	36	57	7	56	40	4	45	49	6
	N=28			N=25			N=53		

Grade 4 Language Arts

Percentile Ranges	Males			Females			TOTAL		
	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above	Below	At	Above
99-90	-	11	-	-	12	-	-	11	-
89-80	-	14	4	4	8	-	2	11	2
79-70	4	14	4	-	26	4	2	19	2
69-60	7	14	-	4	8	4	6	11	-
59-50	7	11	-	4	-	-	6	6	-
49-40	-	4	-		12	4	-	9	-
39-30	-	4	-	-	8	-	-	6	-
29-20	-	-	-	4	-	-	2	-	-
19-10	-	4	-	-	-	4	-	2	2
9- 0	-	-	-	-	-	-	-	2	2
Total	18	75	7	15	69	15	17	72	11
	N=28			N=26			N=54		

QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION AND TEACHER EXPECTATIONS PROFILE FOR 1986-87

QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION SCORE _____/56 TEACHER EXPECTATION SCORE _____/30

Name: _____ Building: _____ Date: _____

0-rarely evident 1-present only at times (inconsistent, sporadic) 2-usually present

DESCRIPTIVE DETAIL INCLUDED IN INDIVIDUAL SCRIPT-TAPES/CONFERENCE REPORTS

___/6 I. PLANNING

0 1 2 A. Curriculum map/year-long overview
0 1 2 B. Chapter or unit planning
0 1 2 C. Daily lesson plans

___/8 II. BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT

0 1 2 A. Behavior plan
0 1 2 B. Pacing, momentum
0 1 2 C. Withitness/smoothness
0 1 2 D. Focusing attention/student involvement

___/6 III. ORGANIZATION OF TIME/SPACE/MATERIALS

0 1 2 A. Academic engaged time; time-on-task
0 1 2 B. Transitions
0 1 2 C. Routine tasks/procedures

___/4 IV. LEARNING CLIMATE

0 1 2 A. Task-orientation; business-like atmosphere
0 1 2 B. Teacher-student interactions

___/8 V. STUDENT ASSESSMENT

0 1 2 A. Entry level skills
0 1 2 B. Performance during instruction
0 1 2 C. Formative assessment (e.g., section of a unit)
0 1 2 D. Summative assessment (e.g., total unit)

___/14 VI. INSTRUCTIONAL METHODS

0 1 2 A. Setting the stage; motivation
0 1 2 B. Identification of lesson objectives
0 1 2 C. Appropriate instructional strategies (modality, grouping, student involvement, presentation mode)
0 1 2 D. Attention to developmental sequence
(quadrant 1: concrete/see)
(quadrant 2: abstract/see)
(quadrant 3: abstract/do)
(quadrant 4: concrete/do)
0 1 2 E. Assignments/application
0 1 2 F. Assessment
0 1 2 G. Intervention (re-teach, enrich, etc.)

___/10 VII. ORAL/WRITTEN COMMUNICATION

0 1 2 A. Written communications
0 1 2 B. Oral communications
0 1 2 C. Content explanations
0 1 2 D. Dealing with learner responses
0 1 2 E. Questioning; fielding responses

TOTAL POINTS FOR QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION _____/56 (_____%)

TEACHER EXPECTATIONS FOR STUDENT ACHIEVEMENT

___/10 I. RESPONSE OPPORTUNITIES

0 1 2 A. Equitable distribution of response opportunities
0 1 2 B. Individual helping
0 1 2 C. Latency (observing wait time)
0 1 2 D. Delving (probing, extending answers)
0 1 2 E. Higher level questioning

___/10 II. FEEDBACK

0 1 2 A. Affirm or correct student response
0 1 2 B. Praise of learning performance
0 1 2 C. Reasons for praise
0 1 2 D. Listening
0 1 2 E. Accepting feelings

___/10 III. PERSONAL REGARD

0 1 2 A. Proximity
0 1 2 B. Courtesy
0 1 2 C. Personal interest, compliments
0 1 2 D. Touching
0 1 2 E. Desisting

TOTAL POINTS FOR TEACHER EXPECTATIONS _____/30 (_____%)

BUILDING SUMMARY OF QUALITY OF INSTRUCTION

reported as percentage of points earned by each teacher for each factor

TEACHER	PLANNING 6 poss. pts	BEHAVIOR MANAGEMENT 8 poss. pts	ORGANIZA OF TIME/ SPACE/MAT'S 6 poss. pts	LEARNING CLIMATE 4 poss. pts	STUDENT ASSESSM'T 8 poss. pts	INSTRUC'L TECHNIQUES 14 pos. pts	ORAL/ WRITTEN COMMUNICA'N 10 pos. pts	TOTAL (56 poss. points)
1 J. Grogan	67%	62%	67%	75%	62%	50%	60%	34=61%
2 D. Walker	100	88	82	100	100	92	90	52=93%
3 T. Chisolm	33	25	16	0	37	28	20	14=25%
4	33	38	33	25	75	71	60	30=53%
5	67	75	83	75	25	86	60	38=68%
6	83	25	33	75	75	43	60	30=63%
7	17	25	33	50	38	57	20	20=36%
8	50	50	66	100	75	71	60	37=66%
9	67	75	67	75	75	86	80	43=77%
10	83	75	100	75	83	86	100	49=87%
11	33	50	50	100	100	100	100	45=80%
12	50	50	33	50	25	86	80	33-59%
13	100	100	83	25	50	43	60	47=84%
14	33	13	17	25	50	43	60	22=39%
15	83	75	67	75	62	71	40	37=66%
16	67	62	67	50	38	29	60	28=50%
17	17	25	50	75	88	71	80	34=61%
18	83	75	67	100	25	78	40	36=64%
19	50	50	50	50	50	50	50	28=50%
20	67	75	67	100	25	71	100	40=71%
21	67	62	50	75	25	64	60	32=57%
22	17	25	67	25	75	71	40	28=50%
23	83	25	17	50	75	57	60	30=53%
24	83	13	17	75	75	50	60	29=52%
25								

BUILDING SUMMARY OF TEACHER EXPECTATIONS

0=rarely evident 1=partially present but inconsistent, sporadic 2=usually present

		RESPONSE OPPORTUNITIES					FEEDBACK					PERSONAL REGARD					TOTAL
	TEACHER	EQUITABLE DISTRIBUTION	INDIVIDUAL HELPING	LATENCY	DELVING	HIGHER LEVEL QUESTIONING &	AFFIRM/CORRECT	PRAISE OF LEARNING PERFORMANCE	REASONS FOR PRAISE	LISTENING	ACCEPTING FEELINGS	PROXIMITY	COURTESY	PERSONAL INTERESTS	TOUCHING	DESISTING	30 pts. poss.
1	J. Grogan	1	0	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	1	15=50%
2	D. Walker	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	28=93%
3	T. Chisolm	1	1	0	0	0	1	0	0	0	0	1	1	1	1	1	8=27%
4		2	1	1	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	0	1	0	0	1	8=27%
5		2	2	1	1	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	2	1	1	1	23=69%
6		1	1	1	1	0	2	2	2	1	2	1	2	1	1	1	19=57%
7		1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	19=57%
8		1	1	2	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	2	1	0	0	1	15=50%
9		2	2	2	1	1	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	25=75%
10		2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	2	1	2	2	2	2	1	27=81%
11		2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	2	1	1	28=92%
12		1	1	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	1	2	1	0	1	17=51%
13		1	1	0	0	0	2	1	0	0	1	1	2	1	1	1	12=36%
14		2	1	0	1	0	2	0	0	1	0	0	1	0	0	0	8=27%
15		1	1	2	1	1	1	2	1	1	1	0	1	1	0	1	15=50%
16		1	1	1	0	0	2	2	0	0	2	0	0	1	1	1	12=40%
17		0	1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	1	1	1	1	0	0	11=37%
18		1	1	1	2	0	1	1	0	1	0	1	2	2	2	1	16=53%
19		1	0	0	1	1	2	0	0	0	0	1	1	0	0	0	7=23%
20		1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	1	1	1	2	2	2	1	22=73%
21		1	2	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	1	2	1	0	0	13=43%
22		1	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	1	1	0	0	1	12=40%
23		1	1	1	1	1	1	1	0	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	13=43%
24		1	1	0	0	1	2	1	1	0	0	1	2	2	1	0	13=43%

INSTRUCTIONAL LEADERSHIP PROFILE

One of the findings of the Effective Schools research is the importance of the building principal as an instructional leader. Please rate the effectiveness of your building principal for each of the following areas of leadership. Use the computer sheet to record your responses. RETURN ONLY THE COMPUTER ANSWER SHEET IN THE MAILING ENVELOPE PROVIDED. Thank you for taking the time to complete this information.

	extremely poor	rather weak	adequate	strong	exemplary/superior
1. Makes clear, consistent, fair decisions	A	B	C	D	E
2. Has knowledge of district (building) curriculum	A	B	C	D	E
3. Suggests materials to use for a particular instructional problem	A	B	C	D	E
4. Suggests alternative materials when preferred choice fails or is not available	A	B	C	D	E
5. Maintains visibility in the building; knows all the students	A	B	C	D	E
6. Is willing to teach classes; will demonstrate and/or team teach on request	A	B	C	D	E
7. Is willing to take a class for a teacher	A	B	C	D	E
8. Is willing to assist teachers with duties (e.g. bus, cafeteria, hall monitoring)	A	B	C	D	E
9. Encourages collegiality among teachers and other staff members	A	B	C	D	E
10. Provides opportunitiesa for teachers to meet on critical issues such as test results or curriculum	A	B	C	D	E
11. Conducts staff meetings that are productive and well organized	A	B	C	D	E
12. Provides for meaningful inservice	A	B	C	D	E
13. Helps teachers set individual job targets or goals	A	B	C	D	E

	extremely poor	rather weak	adequate	strong	exemplary/superior
14. Establishes building goals/priorities and focuses this year's activities on them	A	B	C	D	E
15. Maintains high expectations for teachers	A	B	C	D	E
16. Acknowledges staff accomplishments and encourages staff growth and development	A	B	C	D	E
17. Maintains high expectations for students; monitors student progress	A	B	C	D	E
18. Directs energies and efforts toward student achievement	A	B	C	D	E
19. Recognizes student success	A	B	C	D	E
20. Provides honest and thorough classroom observations	A	B	C	D	E
21. Observes a variety of classroom periods at various times throughout the day	A	B	C	D	E
22. Makes valid suggestions to improve classroom instruction	A	B	C	D	E
23. Encourages and facilitates variety in classroom instruction	A	B	C	D	E
24. Includes staff in decision making	A	B	C	D	E
25. Maintains consistent, fair, and effective discipline	A	B	C	D	E
26. Backs staff members in discipline situations	A	B	C	D	E
27. Maintains effective parent/community relations	A	B	C	D	E
28. Demonstrates school pride in and out the school setting	A	B	C	D	E
29. Attends most school functions	A	B	C	D	E
30. Is sensitive to individual needs and concerns	A	B	C	D	E